

# National Municipal Review

Vol. XXIX, No. 6

Total Number 288

Published by NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

---

## Contents for June 1940

NEWS IN REVIEW .....	354
Editors: <i>H. M. Olmsted</i> , Events; <i>Elwood N. Thompson</i> , Citizen Action; <i>Elwyn A. Mauck</i> , County and Township Government; <i>Wade S. Smith</i> , Taxation and Finance; <i>George H. Hallett, Jr.</i> , Proportional Representation.	
THE LEAGUE'S BUSINESS .....	<i>H. P. J.</i> 356
EDITORIAL COMMENT .....	<i>A. W.</i> 359
THE OLD AND THE NEW IN MASSACHUSETTS TOWNS .....	<i>Richard A. Atkins</i> 361
MAINE'S POLITICAL CHICKENS .....	<i>Edward F. Dow</i> 367
A CIVICS COURSE FOR TODAY .....	<i>Jesse J. Pugh</i> 372
DALLAS WEIGHS CITY-COUNTY MERGER .....	<i>Lewis W. Bailey</i> 376
DENVER CONSOLIDATION A SHINING LIGHT .....	<i>Mayo Fesler</i> 380
PHILADELPHIA'S CITY-COUNTY DILEMMA .....	<i>Frederick P. Gruenberg</i> 385
COUNTY PURCHASING METHODS REVIEWED ..	<i>Robert A. Martino</i> 388
THE BONDED DEBT OF 272 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1940 .....	<i>Rosina Mohaupt</i> 396
CONTRIBUTORS IN REVIEW .....	413
THE RESEARCHER'S DIGEST: JUNE .....	414
BOOKS IN REVIEW .....	<i>Elsie S. Parker</i> 433

---

The contents of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW are indexed in the *Engineering Index Service*, the *Index to Legal Periodicals*, the *International Index to Periodicals* and in *Public Affairs Information Service*.

---

COPYRIGHT JUNE 1940 BY  
NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

# News in Review

## City, County, State Progress in Brief

---

### New York Villages Get Home Rule

*Michigan civil service by  
initiative; state personnel  
boards aid local governments*

---

*New census scents  
trek to the suburbs*

---

*Edited by*

**H. M. OLMSTED**

---

One of the new laws passed by the 1940 New York legislature is a village home rule law (Chapter 823 of the Laws of 1940), drafted by a special committee set up by the legislature last year. This act carries out the mandate of the new state constitution by granting villages of more than 5,000 population home rule powers generally similar to those of cities. The law follows closely in most respects the wording of last year's general revision of the city home rule law, but does not give the voters of a village the right to revise its charter by petition and popular vote. The village boards are given wide powers of local legislation, including the power to supersede special state laws relating to the property, affairs, and government of the village, subject to mandatory or permissive referendum on important matters and certain special restrictions. A village board may submit a new charter for the village or set up a charter commission to draft one for submission.

Another important bill to become law (Chapter 667) is the so-called "little Hatch act" which introduces for the state and its political subdivisions restrictions on the political use of relief and relief lists similar to those of the federal law. The law does not include

the federal law's restrictions on other political activities of public officers and employees.

One important measure which passed both houses was vetoed. This was the bill which would have dispensed with primaries when they were uncontested. Under this bill positions for which there was no contest were to be left off the primary ballot. If a party had no contest for any position in a district, its ballots were not to be printed. If no party had a contest in a district, the polls were not to be opened. Positions for which no designations had been made by petition were to be regarded as contested so that they could be filled by a write-in vote. This bill was expected to save some \$200,000 a year on printing and personnel, would have concentrated public attention on the real primary contests by removing the other positions from the ballot, and would have eliminated the danger of surprise write-in attacks on popular candidates whose election was supposed to be assured. But the Governor considered it more important to preserve the right of insurgent members of a party to support their own candidates at a primary even if they had not taken the trouble to circulate valid designating petitions. The bill did not propose to interfere with the right of anyone to nominate candidates for the final election by independent nominating petitions or to write in names at the final election.

G. H. H., JR.

---

### **Michigan Civil Service Amendment**

A proposed initiative civil service amendment to the constitution of Michigan is being circulated in that state in an effort to obtain 160,000 signatures to place the amendment on the November



ballot. Professor Arthur W. Bromage of the Department of Political Science, University of Michigan, reports progress in this activity. The amendment is as follows:

"Section 22. The state civil service shall consist of all positions in the state service except those filled by popular election, heads of departments, members of boards and commissions, employees of courts of record, of the legislature, of the higher educational institutions recognized by the state constitution, all persons in the military and naval forces of the state, and not to exceed two other exempt positions for each elected administrative officer, and each department, board, and commission.

#### *Governor Appoints Commission*

"There is hereby created a non-salaried civil service commission to consist of four persons, not more than two of whom shall be members of the same political party, appointed by the governor for eight-year, overlapping terms, the four original appointments to be for two, four, six, and eight years respectively. This commission shall supersede all existing state personnel agencies and succeed to their appropriations, records, supplies, equipment, and other property.

"The commission shall classify all positions in the state civil service according to their respective duties and responsibilities, fix rates of compensation for all classes of positions, approve or disapprove disbursements for all personal services, determine by competitive performance exclusively on the basis of merit, efficiency, and fitness the qualifications of all candidates for positions in the state civil service, make rules and regulations covering all personnel transactions, and regulate all conditions of employment in the state civil service. No person shall be appointed to or promoted in the state civil service who has not

been certified as so qualified for such appointment or promotion by the commission. No removals from or demotions in the state civil service shall be made for partisan, racial, or religious considerations.

"The administration of the commission's powers shall be vested in a state personnel director who shall be a member of the state civil service and who shall be responsible to and selected by the commission after open competitive examination.

#### *Appropriations*

"To enable the commission to execute these powers, the legislature shall appropriate for the six-months' period ending June 30, 1941, a sum not less than one-half of one per cent, and for each and every subsequent fiscal year, a sum not less than one per cent, of the aggregate annual payroll of the state service for the preceding fiscal year as certified to by the commission.

"After August 1, 1941, no payment for personal services shall be made or authorized until the provisions of this amendment have been complied with in every particular. Violation of any of the provisions hereof may be restrained or observance compelled by injunctive or mandamus proceedings brought by any citizen of the state.

"This amendment shall take effect on the first day of January following the approval thereof."

The Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research says, in a discussion of the amendment: "The amendment aims to create a complete civil service, free from legislative tampering, and administered by a constitutional commission operating under rigid merit principles. It contains only basic constitutional provisions, and, following the practice of New York, California, and other states, proposes to place civil service above partisan tinker-

(Continued on Page 416)

# The League's Business

## Conference on American Self-Government

THE National Municipal League, as a result of its leadership in organizing the Conference on American Self-government which met at Indiana University on May 13 and 14, has been asked to act as a clearing house to correlate the activities of coöperating institutions and organizations. The conference was attended by more than a hundred persons comprising representatives of many of the 208 coöperating colleges and observers from a score of nation-wide citizen organizations.

Discussions at the conference were focused on specific types of civic activity now being carried on in various parts of the country. There were no set speeches. C. A. Dykstra, president of the League and of the University of Wisconsin, presided at all sessions.

After the first day a Committee on Findings and Recommendations was created with the following personnel: Professor James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan, *chairman*; President Thurston Davies of Colorado College, Dr. Earl De Long of Northwestern University, Dr. Edna R. Fluegel of the College of St. Catherine, and Irvin Kuenzli of the American Federation of Labor. The committee made a report which finally was adopted in the following form:

### FINDINGS

I. The Conference on American Self-Government, meeting at Indiana University under the sponsorship of the National Municipal League, after deliberation in the democratic manner finds:

(1) A great amount of work directed toward the improvement of American self-government is being done by organizations and institutions.

(2) Most of this work is desultory, unsystematic, and disconnected.

(3) There is inadequate knowledge on the part of such organizations as to what is being done by others.

(4) The groups interested in doing something in this field have not always utilized existing sources of information. In many cases these sources are inadequate.

(5) While much attention is being given to the training of students, the educational program is inadequate to give them a constructive interest in the improvement of the governmental process.

(6) Not enough study is being made of the problem of preparing youth for citizenship, especially after the compulsory school age.

(7) With the exception of a few notable programs, the development of a sound method of inducting youth into the full responsibilities of citizenship has been neglected.

(8) Programs to develop adult interest in and understanding of the responsibilities of citizenship are generally inadequate and ineffective.

(9) Since citizenship involves more than the operation of governmental processes and since an interest in the improvement of economic, social, cultural, and spiritual phases of community life is basic, they should be included in a complete program.



*RECOMMENDATIONS*

II. With a view to developing a program to meet these needs, the conference suggests:

(1) In order that the efforts of the various groups in the general field of self-government within communities may be correlated, a national clearing house of information in this field is needed. We believe that the National Municipal League is best equipped to serve in this capacity. We suggest that all organizations and institutions be urged to report their activities along these lines to the National Municipal League.

(2) In order that the suggested recommendations which follow may receive adequate discussion, implementation, and action, it is recommended that representatives of universities and colleges in states or other appropriate areas take the lead in organizing for coöperative effort with civic groups under the general sponsorship of the National Municipal League. The conference wishes to stress the importance, in connection with all programs looking toward training for citizenship, of definite and active coöperation between existing organizations in both urban and rural communities. Coördination of educational, religious, social, and other groups, which has already proved effective in a number of communities, should, in the judgment of the conference, be developed as rapidly as possible in other communities, and training for citizenship should be made an important feature of the coöperative program.

(3) That a general program of civic education be designed to create an understanding of the possibilities of democratic action and a desire for the better utilization of the opportunities presented by democratic institutions and that this effort should be made throughout the whole American educational process.

(4) That encouragement be given to training programs and research activities in schools and colleges which aim to produce mature persons capable of political leadership and research consultants capable of determining facts with respect to political behavior.

(5) That a specific program be developed to meet the problem of preparing youth for citizenship after the compulsory school age.

(6) That a program for the induction of youth into the full responsibilities of citizenship be applied on a nation-wide basis, and that the program involve both a preparatory period of instruction and a final impressive ceremony of induction.

(7) That activity be developed at the adult level around specific problems of citizenship which have been selected democratically by citizens' organizations and educational institutions.

(8) With regard to each specific problem, the responsibility of the colleges and universities should be to develop impartially and objectively the facts which can be used as a basis for discussion.

(9) The responsibility of citizens' organizations should be to use their channels of communication with their own members to encourage widespread discussion of the facts so that people generally may be able to form convictions.

(10) Since there has not been enough emphasis on solving the problem of translating into action the findings of civic and educational agencies, the purpose of all discussion on these problems, therefore, should always be the development of a program which will make effective the participation of citizens.

III. The Conference recommends to the National Municipal League that a small

permanent committee be appointed by the League to the end that the recommendations herein suggested may be carried out on a continuing basis.

HOWARD P. JONES, *Secretary*

## Series of Series

WITH this issue there goes into full swing a new policy for the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW which is expected not only to increase the value of the magazine as a storehouse of information on local government, but also to bring the contents of that storehouse out into the open where any citizen or researcher with a special interest can easily get his hands on what he needs in the way of background. This double-barreled program involves:

1. Series of articles by different authorities on comprehensive subjects in the field of local government will be published in this magazine from month to month. At least two such series will be running at any given time. The rest of the magazine will be devoted, as usual, to articles on miscellaneous subjects of interest.

2. After the full quota of articles on any subject has been published, they will be reprinted in pamphlet or book form and added to the National Municipal League's list of publications, to be sold at the cost of reprinting (which is relatively low, compared with the cost of a book or pamphlet independently printed).

Three such series are represented in this issue of the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW:

"The Old and the New in Massachusetts Towns" is the first in a series which will explore town manager government in the New England States. Already promised for early issues are articles by Professor K. R. B. Flint of the University of Vermont, Carter Atkins, director of the Hartford, Connecticut, Governmental Research Institute, Professor Orren C. Hormell of Bowdoin College, Maine, and Professor Thorsten V. Kalijarvi of the University of New Hampshire.

The pamphlet which results from this series will be the only existing comprehensive work on town manager government in action.

A series on city-county consolidation, which is another subject on which there is no up-to-date comprehensive information, is initiated in this issue with articles from Philadelphia, Dallas, and Denver, respectively. Others already on the list will deal with Atlanta-Fulton County, Georgia, by L. R. Chubb of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce Research Bureau and the One-Government League of that area; Pittsburgh-Allegheny County by H. Marie Dermitt of the Civic Club of Allegheny County; New Orleans, by S. S. Sheppard of the New Orleans Bureau of Governmental Research; Virginia and its independent cities, by Dean Raymond B. Pinchbeck of the University of Richmond; and functional consolidation in Los Angeles by John McDiarmid of the University of Southern California.

Dr. Pugh's article on Zanesville civic education in this number of the REVIEW is the second in a series on civic education which was initiated in the January issue with Professor O. Garfield Jones's exposition of methods used at the University of Toledo. A third article will deal with Pennsylvania's Intercollegiate Conference on Government.

Still another series was initiated this year. William B. Nunn's two articles on labor peace boards in the March and April issues will shortly be followed by a third and last by the same author, in which 'municipal labor peace methods in all cities over 30,000 population will be discussed.



# National Municipal Review

## Editorial Comment

### Kansas City Clings to an Ideal

AS Kansas City takes long strides toward sound and honest government, it is well to consider how much its *form* of charter had to do with the revival. It is eminently proper to do so. Have not the critics of the council-manager plan been picking out Kansas City these fourteen years as the "horrible example"? Have they not cried, over and over, "The manager plan doesn't necessarily insure good government; look at Kansas City." Kansas City always was sufficient; they never looked at Cincinnati, Toledo, Teaneck, Kalamazoo, or the five hundred other places.

In accordance with recent American custom, Boss Pendergast has been serving time for failing to pay income tax on his ill-gotten gains rather than for having fleeced the people of the city and state. Even so, the result was to release the people of Kansas City from the strait-jacket in which Pendergast had confined them.

The ensuing civic effort was tremendous. It had to be. First, a coalition of anti-machine groups adopted a charter amendment which shortened the four-year terms of the incumbent councilmen to two years; in effect, recalling them. A new council of a kind to which the city was not accustomed was elected to replace them. The council proceeded promptly to hire an experienced city manager with a notable success re-

cord, instead of the home-town patronage dispenser type of the past. Government authorities have been called in as consultants to implement the reform with an accurate financial picture, a sound personnel system, etc.

It is all highly encouraging, but Kansas City may not yet be out of the political jungle. For one thing, an attempt has been made to invoke an all but forgotten and usually ignored residence law to disqualify the new manager. For another, the anti-machine elements will have to resist the impulse to put "our boys" in. "Good government" spoils is little better than the other kind.

The city's hopes are well expressed in an editorial in the *Kansas City Star* which said, in part:

"Fourteen years after the people of Kansas City adopted their modern charter they will have their first chance to see what the charter means.

"For the first time they can hope to see the city manager form of government work as it was intended. For the first time they can look to a genuine nonpartisan merit system with services to the city rising above the demands of any bosses or political organization."

Through all its troubles Kansas City's good charter has remained an ideal and a measuring stick. The civic leadership, although relatively helpless before the machine's power,

was able to keep constantly in mind what the city had once voted for and was supposed to have. When something happened at last to expose the Achilles heel of the well armored machine, they could be ready with the answer.

Had there been no sound charter, around which to rally the forces

which demanded change, the escape from boss rule would have been as difficult and complicated as it seems to be in such places as Jersey City, Philadelphia, and other cities where the problem is not only to unseat bossism but also to replace a bad system with a good one which gives the people a chance to control.

---

## Another Post-War Period Coming

**T**HE downward trend of municipal debt, as revealed in the figures for cities over 30,000 in population published elsewhere in this issue of the REVIEW, furnishes hope that our cities are bringing their financial affairs under closer control.

With memories of post-war difficulties still fresh in their minds, those who direct the financial destinies of local government are under a very special obligation to formulate sound, long-time plans in accordance with ability to pay.

In this planning they should give serious and analytical thought es-

pecially to two major trends which represent radical departures from the old conventional debt pattern:

1. There seems to be an increasing tendency toward public borrowing for revenue-producing projects set up in such a way as not to pledge the municipal credit.

2. There still is considerable general purpose borrowing to finance relief.

Despite all the exceptions which must be borne in mind, the size and trend of public debt remain among the best indices of sound management.

---

## The Women

**A**S the peculiarly precious nature of a self-governing democracy stands out more clearly with each new shock from other parts of the world, we are beginning to take more careful stock of our assets and liabilities in the field of citizenship.

Important among the assets are women's civic organizations, and notable among these is the League of Women Voters which recently celebrated the twentieth anniversary of

its founding. It would take volumes to provide even a partial account of this organization's accomplishments in the development of individual and group leadership, in spreading a sense of civic responsibility, in gaining basic improvements locally and in state and nation, and in intelligently standing guard over ground already won.

Few people realize as clearly as

(Continued from Page 366)



# The Old and the New in Massachusetts Towns

*New Englanders continue to preserve old Yankee institutions but introduce twentieth century manager idea to correct obvious weaknesses.*

By RICHARD A. ATKINS  
*Boston Municipal Research Bureau*

TOWN meeting government has a special hold on the imagination of Americans. Many of them trace their heritage to the New England scene and retain an attachment for Yankee institutions. Probably more are persuaded that the town meeting offers a lingering illustration of direct democracy and is therefore doubly worthy of consideration.

Among the changes which modern life has imposed on this venerable scheme of government is the union of the old and the new in those towns operating under a plan of municipal management. It is proposed here to consider only the general terms of this union in four Massachusetts communities.

Five of the 316 towns of the commonwealth have adopted manager charters. One of these—the town of Orange—abandoned the plan because it proved too strong medicine as administered under its only manager. The four remaining places disclose a marked geographical affinity, all lying to the south or southeast of Boston.

Norwood is the largest of the manager towns. With a population of 15,049, it is about double the size of the three other localities. Socially it presents wider extremes and the composition of its population is more varied. While a community with an

economic status of its own, Norwood comes within the metropolitan orbit.

The balance of the manager towns are more than superficially similar. All are modest, middle-class towns which draw their principal livelihood from local trade and manufacture. Stoughton is nearest Boston; Mansfield is on the outside fringe of the commutation zone; and Middleboro is forty miles from Boston.

For the setting it is necessary to review the essentials of town government. First there is the town meeting, of which all the qualified voters are members. This body elects the town officials, votes upon money matters, and lays down rules. The presiding officer is known as the moderator. Ordinarily he appoints a finance committee of the town, which is the steering group in fiscal questions and which lends cohesion to budgetary issues. Finance committee recommendations are the chief guide when the appropriation articles are considered at town meeting and deviation from their judgment is regarded as rather exceptional. Curiously enough, control over expenditures passes to the spending agencies, and book-keeping is entrusted to the town accountant.

Normally the most important agencies chosen by vote of the town are the board of selectmen, school com-

mittee, library trustees, water commissioners, board of health, assessors, and such individuals as the treasurer and town clerk. Residual appointive officers of an earlier and more picturesque day include measurers of wood and bark, fence viewers, field drivers, and tree wardens.

At the center of this interesting arrangement, and exercising the largest single measure of authority, are the selectmen. They are directly answerable to the town meeting, which in some respects may either override the selectmen or act independently of them. In Massachusetts towns selectmen are charged with such problems as street lines, land takings, licenses and permits, contracts, claims against the town, and the enforcement of town regulations. In addition, they are deep in the affairs of numerous town activities which come under their direct control—fire, police, building inspection, and the like. Often the selectmen serve as the board of public welfare or park commissioners.

#### A GOOD START

Had Massachusetts towns pursued municipal management to its logical limits, the resulting product would have borne slight resemblance to traditional town meeting government. This was too much to expect. Consequently, the starting point was to preserve the form of town government and yet correct its obvious weaknesses, while securing a measure of permanent and technically competent direction for certain important phases of town business. Varying motives lay behind adoption of the plan in each of the manager towns—

political interest of the business leadership type, desire to overcome a particular source of grievance, dissatisfaction with financial trends. All reveal a common desire to secure increased efficiency and more nearly unified organization.

Norwood, which put the original town manager plan into effect twenty-five years ago, left the town meeting untouched. Qualified voters elected, as always, the board of selectmen and the school committee. Similarly chosen were the library trustees, board of health, planning board, treasurer and collector, and a finance commission.

Whereas the last-named was given wide power relating to town finance, its principal duty was and has remained the preparation of the town budget and recommendations for the appropriation articles in the warrant of the town meeting. Stoughton set up a similar commission. These agencies are none other than the usual finance committee which Mansfield and Middleboro happen to have retained.

In the town manager charters the first noteworthy break with customary town government occurs where the authority of the selectmen is defined. In Norwood several theretofore separate activities were placed under the board of selectmen. These included the water, sewer, and park commissioners, and the municipal light board. The selectmen appointed the town counsel, the clerk (with whom the office of accountant was joined), the assessors, and the public welfare board.

Having established this framework, the Norwood plan introduced what was in truth a novelty. It required



the selectmen to appoint a general manager who was to act as head of such departments under their control as were not otherwise provided for. The manager's sphere embraced all the public works and utilities of the town, together with building maintenance, recreation, and police. For reasons which may be surmised, the board of fire engineers was omitted. The police department went under the manager with the ambiguous qualification that his control was subject to the "general direction" of the selectmen—a proviso which gave them a voice in the delicate issues of police operation.

During 1921 and 1922 the plan was taken up by the other three towns. Mansfield offers the widest contrast because it boldly reduced the agencies elected by the town to the school committee and the selectmen and vested the latter with extraordinary authority. Furthermore, under the Mansfield law more has been turned over to the manager. Virtually every town function comes within his purview except the schools, library, fire, assessing, and planning. Unlike the other town managers he may even appoint the treasurer and collector.

Stoughton furnishes another variant. Departments under the manager comprise water, highways, and a small group of miscellaneous activities where his control is unqualified; police and fire where he is explicitly subject to the direction of the selectmen; and health, welfare, parks, and sewerage where the manager serves as administrative officer and the selectmen as the governing board.

From a structural viewpoint, one

can readily see that the manager charters were by no means guided exclusively by formula. More than one well situated official was removed from the manager's domain in order to assure the plan vital support.

#### THE MANAGERS' DUTIES

Town managers have legal backing in their particular realms. They are given fairly extensive power to appoint and remove department heads and subordinate employees. They make purchases for their own departments and may act on behalf of other agencies. The manager prepares budget estimates for his own activities and submits them to the finance committee or commission. To state how far these legal proprieties are observed or neglected is beyond the scope of this brief survey; in any event it is a problem found everywhere. Nevertheless, the authority is present. When the manager of Norwood recently elected to call for a show-down on his charter prerogatives, he received the town's backing.

It must be apparent, however, that a town manager in Massachusetts is not the same as the city manager with whom he will be compared. Normally a municipal manager is entrusted with liberal control over finance because such power is felt to be an indispensable tool of management. Accounting, assessing, treasury and collecting, and the final stages of the budget are located elsewhere in the manager towns. Moreover, the list of operating activities outside the manager is considerable.

From this background the town manager emerges not so much as a replica of the city manager but as

someone akin to a commissioner of public works. Indeed, one authority on the subject suggests that he might be called engineer, superintendent, or even supervisor with equal impunity, although literal acceptance of this point of view would do an injustice to the personality of the managers and the possibilities of their position. Any appointive official who has enough influence to carry the voters with him on the issue of his own independence cannot be hastily characterized as a mere supervisor.

A town manager is naturally closest to the selectmen who appoint and remove him. Under the manager plan they are relieved of administrative responsibility as such and are supposed to devote their energy to those aspects of their office which veer toward policy-making. Exceptions to this broad rule relate to functions not turned over to the manager, to managerial activities where the selectmen have a special advisory standing, and to that peculiar area where practicalities, not rules, are uppermost.

Responsibility is carried a step further. Each of the town manager charters contains a recall provision which may be brought into action with little trouble. At times the recall feature has figured in the history of town management, the point in controversy being the particular relationship existing between the selectmen and the manager.

Measured by the simple criterion of acceptance, the manager plan appears to be well supported in the towns. While Orange must be put down as a backslider, it is not easy

to discover important sentiment for revocation in the other communities. All of them have experienced hard going at one time or another, but it has been due to factional strife and problems relating to individual managers and not, if such a distinction is permissible, to hostility toward town management.

Stoughton's manager has been on the job since the plan went into effect eighteen years ago. In Norwood there have been four managers over twenty-five years with terms ranging from two to seven years. One manager served at two intervals separated by a decade. Mansfield has also had four managers, although the present incumbent has served for the last twelve years. Middleboro has had two managers. The first was with the town for a long span; the second has held his position since 1938. Three of the managers have an engineering or business background and a fourth came into his position with experience in town finance. All but one had some previous training in the public service.

#### PROSPECTS FOR WIDER ADOPTION

In a governmental setup where the usual arguments for municipal management apply, the question arises as to why the town manager plan has not been more popular. Tradition is invariably offered in explanation and town government has a history which has been traced to Anglo-Saxon settlements and other remote origins.

Coming closer to earth, there is the absence of serious scandal and similar episodes which encourage wholesale turnover. In many towns the group which might be attracted



to the manager plan on its merits may already have a grip on the town government and consequently is not concerned over charter revision on the chance that it would shift the prevailing political balance.

Massachusetts towns actually have little so-called home rule. They are implemented by general law with the necessities of local government but for any marked departure either as to structure or function they must have the approval of the legislature. There is no law prescribing a uniform system of town manager government. A town which wants the plan must draft a charter and petition the General Court (legislature) for a special act which will be referred to the town meeting for acceptance or rejection.

#### STATE-LOCAL RELATIONS

State supervision, moreover, takes a great variety of forms. It is commonly thought of in terms of control of local finance. Towns come under a statutory debt limit, and the term, purpose, and nature of their debt are regulated by law. Local assessors and tax collectors are objects of considerable State House solicitude. Localities which have applied for the installation of uniform state accounts and which receive periodic state audits include the four manager towns. Massachusetts towns have a record of soundness and freedom from the financial difficulties that are a frequent prelude to municipal management. Defaults and fiscal breakdown provide a concrete case for the manager plan. Where compelling reasons such as these are lacking, relatively few are attracted to change.

The prevalence of advisory boards, administrative commissions, and minor appointive and elected officials actively enlists a large number of citizens in the service of the town. Civic interest is thus enlivened and at the same time conditioned against concentrated authority. Robert Frost has described the shrewd, immediate interest which town meeting members sometimes exhibit. When the annual report was circulated in one town of his acquaintance, not only did it undergo sharp scrutiny but the highest praise which the officials involved could hope for was the mere absence of blame. Reckoning must be made of a New England habit of mind which is at once acutely critical and complacently disposed toward things as they are.

An attitude at the State House which may be expressed as something less than enthusiastic should be taken into account, for it is there that townspeople are apt to carry their troubles and seek counsel.

On the other hand, there are reasons for believing that town management may secure wider favor. In the larger communities the town meeting has become unwieldy or attendance is poor. A satisfactory turnout on election day is to be expected but at subsequent meetings, when the town business is taken up, interest dwindles. Cases are cited where the town meeting is packed by groups who are concerned over some one article which touches their interest but who disappear once their ends are accomplished.

As town government becomes more complicated and involves arduous detail, the town hall tends to attract

those who, for selfish reasons, are prepared to place their talents freely at the town's disposal. Bedevilled by mounting expenditures and shrinking valuations, some towns have entered a period of strain for the taxpayer and are likely to face increased pressure for changes which hold the promise of economy.

Over a score of Massachusetts towns have accepted the representative town meeting as a concession to the futility of packing several thousand voters into a hall for the purpose of itemized decision. Some halting steps have been taken toward centralizing various functions under the selectmen in an effort to solve the organizational riddle without going so far as to introduce a town manager.

Meanwhile there is testimony that the town manager plan has been beneficial in shifting administration from an elective board to a qualified individual. Its friends are sure that good results flow from single direction of public works, which are after all the backbone of government in a small community, and they are equally certain that it is well to have one figure at the town hall who is the focus of responsibility.

Such claims should keep town management alive in Massachusetts. Interest in city management has been revived by recent enactment of an optional council-manager charter which carries the proportional representation feature. There have been signs of stirring in the towns, with activity ranging all the way from preliminary discussion to enactment, though not adoption, of a manager plan.

## EDITORIALS

(Continued from Page 360)

do members of the League of Women Voters the fact that it takes continuous study in addition to good intentions to be a responsible citizen in a country where the individual is still important and able, if he knows how, to see that his wishes are translated into action. This is probably the most noteworthy characteristic of the league—the sweetly unassuming rejection of the old theory that everyone in this country just automatically comes into the world with full knowledge about government and how to run it.

In city after city members, equipped with the knowledge and training developed in their league activities, have provided enlightened leadership for their communities' efforts to defeat vicious influences, gain the adoption of new charters or other basic improvements, and to pierce with facts the armor of political deceit. Recent examples will be found in Superior, Wisconsin, which was heralded as the five hundredth city to adopt the council-manager form of government; in Kansas City, Missouri, where corrupt bossism has been defeated; and in Yonkers, New York, where the principal woman civic leader in important reforms confesses she never gave public affairs half a thought until she joined the league five years ago.

It is through such organizations as the League of Women Voters, with their practical, serious approach to basic problems, that democracy will be saved and citizens taught how to make democracy work.



# Maine's Political Chickens

*Until there is an aroused and effective public opinion, political chickens will continue to come home to roost, as they have been doing for decades.*

By **EDWARD F. DOW**  
*University of Maine*

## Chronology

- 1930 N. I. P. A. investigates and reports on state administration, recommending reorganization.
- 1931 Legislature accepts a bill (code act) providing partial reorganization. Bill held up by referendum petition, accepted by voters in special election.
- 1932 Code act goes into effect; officials appointed. Finance department organized.
- 1932 A. E. Buck criticizes bookkeeping methods used by state controller. Says that bookkeeping machinery will not provide brains.
- 1938 Robbery or shortage of \$35,000 over the February 26 week-end from the branch automobile registry office at Auburn. No arrests.
- 1939 December. The *Bangor Daily News* publishes series of articles, beginning December 9, entitled "Digging Into Maine's Financial Statements," and purporting to show laxness, inefficiency, and unsound accounting and financial reporting. December. State Auditor states in writing to the Governor that he has examined the accounts of the controller and found them in good order.
- 1940 February. Due to criticism, the State Auditor and Controller request the Governor to engage a private firm to make an independent state audit. April. On April 1 Controller Runnels found with two bullet wounds near heart. Warrant issued, charging him with embezzlement. Ernst and Ernst audit discloses large shortage of state funds. While Runnels hovers between life and death, over

\$26,000 in cash is returned by his brother in a brief case, other sums seized by state in various safe deposit boxes held by Runnels, his brother, and mother. The Deputy Treasurer, State Auditor, and Finance Commissioner resign under pressure, the State Treasurer refuses to resign and is allowed to hold his job pending a special session of the legislature. (Auditor and Treasurer are selected by the legislature, or the President of the Senate if the legislature is not in session.)

**G**OVERNOR Barrows has termed the misuse and embezzlement of state money "a black page in the history of Maine." No doubt citizens of Maine, shocked and angered by the disclosures of April Fool's Day and afterward, would agree. It is freely predicted that more disclosures are to come, and more heads will fall. With the personal and political fortunes involved we are not concerned; before the episode is closed all too much will have been written and said, conjectured and surmised. The finger of suspicion is likely to blacken the reputation of the innocent, while the guilty escape with little or no punishment. At the present writing it seems that only a few persons were directly involved in speculation or connived and schemed at theft.

We do not, of course, desire to whitewash the situation, but in our search for the scapegoats we should not be so foolish as to believe that

laws or officials can guarantee competence and honesty. No matter how carefully drawn, laws must be interpreted and enforced by individuals; no matter how carefully selected, officials are sometimes careless or corrupt. Banks and other private businesses too often discover the frailty of human nature when subjected to temptation. We should not expect government employees to be perfect or to attain an ethical level much higher than is found in the business world. Yet there are remediable defects in Maine government, which may have contributed to inefficiency and theft, and which should be corrected.

1. *What is wrong with the code of 1931?*<sup>1</sup> It is characteristic of Americans to blame the law for administrative failures. So far as the code act goes, it appears to be sound. Its chief accomplishments were in finance and health and welfare. The new Department of Finance was to be headed by a commissioner appointed by the governor and council. Under his direction were to be a tax assessor, budget officer, purchasing agent, and controller, all four to be appointed by the commissioner, subject to approval by the governor and the council. Centralized purchasing and accounting, improved budgetary procedure, and partial coördination of financial matters under the governor and the finance commissioner were real achievements. The governor was given power to propose fiscal bills to the state legislature, and in

theory was made the real head of state government by the code act, but the act did not go far enough.

#### MORE REORGANIZATION NEEDED

The partial and half-hearted reorganization of 1931 should be revised and extended, in order to make the governor the real, responsible head of state affairs, and to provide him with the proper machinery and staff to carry out his duties. No complete reorganization and coördination of Maine government has taken place since statehood was achieved in 1820. Two score departments, commissions and other agencies form a ramshackle structure, lines of authority and responsibility are vague, varying and often conflicting functions overlap, laws are ambiguous, and few officials have a clear knowledge of their own powers and duties, or the degree of control possessed over subordinates. State liquor stores, unemployment compensation, and old-age assistance are new functions which have not been properly organized or coördinated with older departments. After careful study, the structure of administration should be simplified and coördinated and lines of authority and responsibility clarified.

The check and balance system works so efficiently in Maine that responsibility is lost along with authority. A few examples of archaic underbrush that should be cut away will illustrate the point. The governor's council of seven is selected biennially by the legislature from seven council districts. It holds frequent meetings, and, in effect, serves as a third house in continuous session.

<sup>1</sup>For a summary of the provisions and accomplishments of the act see: "Maine's Administrative Code." By E. F. Dow, NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, September 1931.



Its powers over finance and appointments are considerable, and a weak Republican governor, or a Democrat, may be almost wholly at the mercy of the Republican-controlled council. The political power and prestige of the council is attested by the eagerness with which men seek membership. Moreover, members often "graduate" to well paid administrative positions.

#### GOVERNOR'S POWERS RESTRICTED

The governor's responsibility and authority should not be hampered by a legislatively selected council. However, the complexity of modern administration demands so much from an executive that he should have expert advice and assistance. Maine might well study the legislative council as used in Kansas and several other states. Through a permanent research staff such a body could study major problems, prepare information, and draft proposed legislation. The legislature could then devote much of its time to a study of the proposals submitted, with a great deal of the technical study and spade work taken off its hands. Freed in this way, the legislature could concentrate on policy rather than on confusing details, and could hope to reach reasoned and reasonable conclusions on such matters as reorganization, tax reform, and other subjects of pressing moment which appear to baffle it periodically. The governor would have as much influence with the council as his abilities warranted, but could in no sense decide legislative policy. On the administrative side, the council might advise the governor at his request,

but could not control his administrative acts. He would always have the privilege of calling in department heads, individually or as a "cabinet," for advice and assistance in administration.

The governor is seriously checked in those departments where he has no power of appointment. The heads of agriculture, state, law, and treasury are elected by the legislature for fixed terms. It is unfair to hold a governor responsible for officials whom he cannot control, yet that is exactly what our check and balance system purports to do. If the constitution were amended to abolish the governor's council as it now exists, and to make all department heads appointed by the governor, we should be taking a forward step. The four departments named should be reorganized and coördinated with other units. Anomalous and overlapping functions should be dropped or redistributed. For example, various taxes are collected by the attorney-general and secretary of state, instead of the tax assessor.

Other improvements could be made in the organization and procedures of the finance department, the budget system, and the auditor's office. Clear, brief reports should be issued for the information of the people and the legislature. There is always danger in prescribing too minutely in such matters, and it is doubtful if the accounting forms should be specified in detail, as has been suggested by some persons. Detail is not a substitute for honesty and competence, and may result in handcuffing an administrator with obsolete or unworkable regulations.

Numerous speaking engagements, social and political duties, cut heavily into the governor's time, rendering his attention to administrative supervision entirely inadequate. Perhaps he should be given one or more administrative assistants to act as business managers. Or we might well apply the city manager idea, and set up a state manager as administrative head.

#### LAX OBSERVANCE OF LAW

2. *Have the laws, including the code, been enforced?* There are many reasons to doubt if the wording and spirit of the reorganization act of 1931 have been understood or applied. Many instances of misinterpretation or misapplication have been cited in Maine newspapers during April and May of 1940. These incidents apparently involve several departments, but until fully set forth and authenticated cannot be cited as fact.

Enough has now been brought out to show that the word and spirit or intent of a law must be carried out if the law is to work, and that men and motives may nullify good laws. When a controller, who is forbidden to handle funds, is allowed to do so, when certain accounts supposed to be audited are not audited, when department heads are given no choice of subordinates whom they are supposed to select, and when a subordinate supplants his department head in authority as well as in salary, the law is evidently not being observed. Charges on these scores are being circulated freely, and in some instances derelictions have long been known or suspected.

3. *Have competent officials been chosen for the state service?* There is no reason for poor administration more fundamental or more frequently overlooked in Maine than patronage in appointments. The legislature of 1931 cut the heart out of reorganization when it refused to pass a civil service act. Six years later, in 1937, the present act was signed. It is in some respects a weak measure, although all the legislature would accept. If or when the law is fully in force, it will still exempt certain major units, and all higher officials. Maine has not had a governor or legislature in ardent support of a merit system. Lower positions have usually been filled by spoils appointees. Higher offices have often been filled by persons who have served in the legislature, perhaps after that in the governor's council.

Competence has been a minor or negligible consideration in all too many cases, and downright and obvious incompetence has not barred those with political influence. That we have had so many honest and competent officials is a tribute to human nature and not to the system of selection. The act of 1937 should be extended and fully enforced. While there may be debate as to how near the top the merit system should go, it cannot be argued that department and bureau heads should escape responsibility because of lack of competence or ignorance of what goes on in their departments, or because they are political appointees.

4. *Is the Republican party in Maine at fault?* Maine is generally Republican, and has been since 1840. On the rare occasions when it elects



a Democrat as governor, it returns a Republican majority to the legislature. In some sessions the state senate, with thirty-three members, has no Democrats, while the House with 151 members will have a mere handful of Democrats. One Republican faction is sometimes referred to as the "Kennebec gang," and is said to be in power frequently. It is not so much the fault of the Republican party *per se*, as of those who vote Republican from tradition, inheritance or group loyalty.

A one-party state, whatever the label of the party, is not politically healthy. There is no strong opposition, and the function of criticism and the provision of an alternative program are noticeably absent. Republicanism in Maine does not lack its party feuds and factions, but these interparty bickerings do not provide a substitute for a strong opposition party. One party, in

power over long periods, is almost sure to grow careless and even corrupt, so long as there is no strong public demand for a change.

*Conclusions.* The code act of 1931 is not responsible for corrupt and inefficient government at Augusta, but many of the conditions which led to the act are still in existence and should be remedied. Further reorganization and centering of responsibility are needed. The laws should be enforced in letter and spirit. Above all, the voters must demand reform, including the selection of competent administrators. Until there is an aroused and effective public opinion, political chickens will continue to come home to roost, as they have been doing for decades. The solution rests with the public and the legislature. A legislative investigation followed by remedial legislation would be a proper beginning.

In a republic like ours the people will never get better government than they are capable of creating. In the final analysis, a government by the people is just what the people make it to be, so the place to begin is with the individual citizen. . . . There is no more crying need in America today than that of returning local government to the people by making it easier for the citizens to participate and more difficult for the professional politicians to control.

JOHN W. ESTERLINE, President of the Indianapolis Citizens' Council, in address before Indianapolis Rotary Club.

# A Civics Course for Today

*Why can we not use civic education to achieve the same worthy end in our local communities as we have used it in the past in connection with our national government?*

By **JESSE J. PUGH**

*Supervisor of Civic Education, Zanesville, Ohio*

**O**UR *Community in Action*, a civics course for ninth grade students in Zanesville, Ohio, was written on the assumption that the pupil of junior high school age needs to become more intimately acquainted with the problems of his immediate community.

What is to be the destiny of the American community? This is a question which today challenges sociologists and students of government alike. We hear many explanations for the tendency of the modern American local government to lose the well integrated character by which early American community life was characterized.

Certain it is that, whatever the explanation, there is in the average American municipality a growing lack of community spirit on the part of its citizens. Unfortunately, as the economic and political independence of the community has decreased with changing conditions, there seems to have been a corresponding loss of independence in a moral sense. It is chiefly because of this lack of moral independence, or integrity, that we find the local unit of government depending more and more upon the state or federal government for those services which it should be able to render itself. In dealing with crime, in caring for the poor, and in raising taxes for the support of schools and the construction of streets, we find

the city or village becoming more and more inclined to shift responsibility to higher levels of government.

Unfortunately, most of our civics work in the schools has been too greatly concerned with national government at the expense of local issues. The result is that we frequently encounter the rather amusing situation of the pupil who can recite glibly the names of the members of the United States Supreme Court, but who cannot give the names of the council members of his own town. In almost any classroom in the country we can find members of civics classes discussing the latest issues before Congress, but in all too few do we find them discussing such matters of local importance as better fire equipment, improvements in playgrounds and parks, or the better regulation of local traffic. These are the things toward which the attention of our pupils must be directed if we are to make any headway in the improvement of our towns and cities.

Civics textbooks have ordinarily been of little if any help in the achievement of such a purpose. It is true, of course, that most of the textbooks now on the market give attention to local affairs, but their treatment of the topic is usually too general to be effective. What is needed is a treatment of local affairs which is aimed not toward what is con-



ceived to be the average community, but toward one community in particular.

In our work in Zanesville we have made an attempt to bring before the pupil examples of the particular sort of problems which the adults of his community face. Our course is organized around three main classes of problems: (1) those concerned with local welfare, (2) those dealing with civic betterment, and (3) those related strictly to government.

#### COMMUNITY PROBLEMS DISCUSSED

One outstanding feature of this course is that the work of the classroom is, wherever possible, made to coincide with the issues which are at the moment facing the adult members of the community. Thus, our study of welfare work is so arranged as to receive major emphasis at exactly the same time that the adults of the community are working on the community chest drive. Pupils are directed to a thorough study of the history and purposes of charitable giving and the various systems by which funds for this purpose are dispensed. Attention to the details of the organization of our own and other community chests is included as part of this study. Frequent visits to local welfare institutions are made for the purpose of gathering information.

Moreover, pupils take part in activities which provide opportunity for actual induction into this particular community activity. One of these is a community fund drive in the civics classes in which money is solicited from pupils by means of an organization built essentially on the lines of the local community fund

campaign. On another occasion the civics pupils, with the help of the teachers, after making a careful study of the local community fund, drew up a manual of questions and answers on community chests which was mimeographed in quantities and made available to the general public.

Every year, during the time of the community fund drive, a speakers' bureau is organized among high school seniors, and from this bureau speakers are sent out to make short talks for the community fund. Some of them visit local theatres and speak during changes of performances; others visit the various elementary schools of Zanesville; while still others visit the consolidated schools of the outlying county.

The radio station of Zanesville plays an important part in our civics program. The management of this station encourages school participation and pupils of the various civics classes put on programs from time to time which have much value from a local civic standpoint. The newspapers also come into the picture by giving publicity to various school civic projects. Such publicity has stimulated no little rivalry on the part of the teachers in trying out new procedures.

In the classroom the work is conducted largely on the laboratory plan, with due allowance for variations in the abilities and interests of the pupils. The course of study has been arranged with sufficient flexibility to permit both teachers and pupils to draw upon their originality and imagination. In addition to doing the minimum assignments, pupils are encouraged to work on extra

projects for which they secure additional recognition in the way of marks.

#### CIVIC GROUPS STUDIED

The study of local institutions comprises the core of our civics program. Not only are local welfare organizations under this category, but various business, civic, financial, and industrial organizations are likewise included. For example, the work of the Chamber of Commerce, both as a national and as a local unit, is given considerable study. Due to the scarcity of school literature on the latter organization, it was necessary to prepare special pamphlets which explained the work of the Chamber of Commerce in language that junior high school pupils could understand.

Quite as important in this connection is the study of labor organizations. Local labor representatives have made important suggestions for the course of study and a considerable quantity of literature concerning the labor movement is being used in the classroom.

In connection with their work on local government, pupils are directed not only to the study of the local situation as such, but are likewise encouraged to see how our own local government compares with the governments of other communities. Under local government, city, county, and township units are included. The various setups of each local government are studied, so that the student will have opportunity to decide for himself which kind is more suitable to the needs of his community. In the case of city government, the city manager and commission forms

receive attention along with the more traditional mayor-council form. The study of local government is made as realistic as possible, the pupil being given the opportunity to see its defects as well as its good points.

Because of the importance of the subject, the matter of better housing has been given a place in our civics course. In this connection pupils are directed to a study of the acute situation presented by the rented houses of the city, the vast majority of which are considered substandard dwelling units. An interesting body of data on the subject has been made available through a federal housing project recently undertaken in the community.

What is considered the most significant feature of our new course of study is the stimulation that it gives to the student to do original thinking on civic problems. As an example of the type of work done in the classroom, the following projects involving local civic needs are submitted:

- Building and plumbing inspection
- Public rest rooms
- Regulation of signs and awnings
- New school buildings
- Playgrounds and parks
- Better housing
- Municipal auditorium
- Beautification of city approaches
- Better garbage disposal
- Smoke elimination
- Street cleaning
- Food inspection
- Restaurant inspection
- New fire equipment
- Street improvements
- City water softeners
- Elimination of Dug Road hazard



Tuberculosis sanitarium  
Refuse containers for streets  
Tax revenue increase for local government.

It is interesting to note that, when asked to rate these items in the order of their importance, civics pupils placed them in the same order as had a group of leading citizens who had also been asked to rate the items.

It is for the purpose of stimulating critical thinking on problems that many of the questions being used in our new civics course are questions without definite answers. What is your opinion concerning this policy, or what do you think should be done in a case of this sort, are examples of the questions which are being made to replace many of the usual factual questions. We believe that the pupil who will some day be called on to use his judgment on civic issues cannot be expected to use that judgment effectively unless he has had previous experience in so doing. The civics classroom is the proper place to acquire such experience.

Training for citizenship, as it was first conceived, was training in loyalty and patriotism to the national government.

It is natural that the early American educators should first think of civics as a means of teaching national patriotism. A heterogeneous people had to be welded together if our country were to grow and prosper. How to Americanize the immigrant is a problem that has always

challenged those interested in American education. This is evident from the strong emphasis that civics textbooks have been inclined to give to the topic of naturalization. Moreover, the very greatness of the size of our country, composed as it is of forty-eight sovereign states representing every variety of sectional interest, could well have been expected to make many people conscious of the importance of teaching national solidarity in the school room.

#### COMMUNITY STUDY NEEDED

But today we find ourselves living in a strong nation, one which is as safe from the standpoint of solidarity as any now in existence. We have demonstrated in one hundred fifty years of history that democracy can stand the test of time. We have likewise taught the world how a variety of independent states can unite and form a great nation which lives in peace with itself.

Our local governments, on the other hand, have not acquired the strength and certainty of position that most of us would like to see them acquire. And our communities have lost much of their former solidarity. Why, we may ask, can we not use civic education to achieve the same worthy end in our local communities as we have used it in the past in connection with national government? This would not be a panacea for all of our local troubles, but it would go a long way toward their solution.

# Dallas Weighs City-County Merger

*Newspaper editor recounts advantages of unification of local governments; estimated savings of \$200,000 possible under streamlined setup.*

By LEWIS W. BAILEY  
*Editor, The Dallas Journal*

TEXAS, by an amendment to its constitution, has made possible the merger of city and county government in counties of more than 62,000 population. The constitutional amendment applies to at least a dozen of the 254 counties that comprise the state. The legislature has passed an enabling act which sets up the procedure under which such mergers can be accomplished. By special act of the legislature the law may be made to apply to smaller counties.

The same constitutional amendment and "home rule act" permit the reorganization of county government. Under them any county in the state may abandon the outmoded government set up when Texas became a state, with its divided authority, its long ballot, and the opportunities it offers for buck-passing and confusion. Modification of the present system, or a county manager plan or commission government may be adopted, as each county may elect.

This amendment was adopted in 1933. One might think that within seven years some Texas counties would be operating thereunder. As a matter of fact, efforts have been made in a half dozen counties to establish home rule. But local opposition and the difficulties which the enabling act puts in the way of its application have made all efforts vain.

To adopt a home rule charter the

votes of the urban and rural voters must be counted separately and each group of voters must give a majority in favor of the home rule charter. The difficulty of getting a majority both in city and county is apparent, especially with the traditional suspicion of rural residents that the cities are "trying to put something over on them."

Even more does this suspicion operate to defeat a favorable vote on merger of city and county governments.

The Texas home rule law provides further that the county may contract with the principal city in the county to perform some of the county functions for not more than two years at a time and may assume governmental or proprietary functions of a city.

With all of these possibilities, and despite years of discussion, there are no home rule county charters in effect in Texas and no mergers of city and county functions have been effected. And this despite the fact that city and county merger and the short ballot were advocated eighteen years ago in the League of Texas Municipalities by the then editor of *The Dallas Journal*, and that twelve years ago Dr. J. F. Kimball, former superintendent of Dallas public schools, in an admirable book on Dallas and its government which is used as a text-



book in the Dallas public schools, pointed the advantage of combining city and county government.

More recently, difficulty in the joint operation of the city-county hospital system and in meeting the relief load have led this writer to make renewed editorial suggestions that merger of city and county government would relieve the situation. The editorials brought requests for further discussion of the subject from a number of local service clubs and questions and comment revealed a genuine interest and solid sentiment for merger. The Dallas organization of the League of Women Voters has been making a study of county government and is also interested in the possibility of merger.

#### BOROUGH PLAN CONSIDERED

In 1939 a movement was started by the Dallas Citizens Council, composed of more than one hundred major business executives, for a merger of Dallas, Highland Park, and University Park, the latter cities being suburbs of Dallas. The merger here proposed was to be effected by the adoption of a borough system which would leave a large degree of self-government to each. It seems that here might be a plan which would admit of adaptation and extension to the county. But officials of all three cities raised objection to some of the proposed provisions of the merger and the plan has never been brought to a vote of the citizens. Thus goes a-glimmering this possibility.

Some of the advantages of merger of city and county governments as

revealed in Dallas County—and would be paralleled elsewhere—follow:

#### LARGE SAVINGS POSSIBLE

Under county government the county judge and commissioners court cost about \$30,000 a year, and have only partial control over the expenditure of three and a half million dollars annually. Dallas' city manager and city council cost \$28,000 a year and administer expenditures totaling \$11,000,000. For little more than the \$30,000 which is paid the county judge and commissioners court a county manager and county council could administer the responsibilities of the entire area of Dallas County, including incorporated cities.

The office of county tax assessor and collector is given \$157,000 a year to assess and collect state and county taxes for the entire county, including the cities therein. The city of Dallas expends a little over \$92,000 on the office of tax assessor and collector, and each other municipality in the county duplicates the work of the county assessor and collector.

The county auditor's department expends \$47,000 a year in checking the handling of the three and a half million dollars of county tax collections and fees and the money collected for the state. The city auditor's department is allowed \$28,000 a year for the rendering of a similar service over the expenditure of \$11,000,000. A substantial saving could be made here in the merger of city and county.

The budget and finance department of the county spends \$65,000

annually—including the maintenance of the three county buildings. The administration and budget department of the city spends \$25,000 a year.

The policing of the city costs \$682,000 a year, and no policeman may step over the city line to make an arrest. The sheriff's department spends \$187,000 annually and can function in law enforcement in city and county. Between these two departments friction often arises, though the present administrations are functioning harmoniously. The sheriff also has state duties in connection with the courts and is business manager of the jail.

Health services and aid to the needy have been merged after a fashion, though each maintains an administrative setup which might well be consolidated. And here, also, friction frequently occurs. It rises in nearly every administration over city and county hospital administration.

These are some of the points of contact and duplication where better and more economical government would result with a unified city-county government.

The judicial system maintained under the control of the state would continue to be operated as now, but election at the same time as city-county officials would reduce the cost of elections.

But the functions of sheriff, county clerk, county treasurer, tax assessor and collector, and other administrative activities could be administered by appointees of a council and the elected council would then be directly

responsible for each department of the county government outside the courts.

The economies effected by a merger and streamlining of city-county government might well reach more than \$200,000 a year.

The extension of metropolitan services to outlying areas would be expedited. The incorporated communities would find that the central purchasing system would effect economies for them, that utility rates would be lower.

#### FINANCIAL ADJUSTMENTS

The biggest problem in connection with a city and county merger would involve assessment for taxes. A home assessed at \$2,000 in the city will pay \$49.80 city taxes. One valued at \$2,000 in the county will pay \$14.60 taxes.

Some subdivisions of the county are under contract one way or another for most of the services city dwellers have. But the cost of owning a suburban home is on the whole lower than in the city. And most of the farms, of course, have none of the urban services except as provided by individually-owned equipment. The fear of the rural areas is that their tax values will be raised to approach city levels and the city tax rate applied. If the state abandons collection of ad valorem taxes, leaving such taxes to the counties and cities, and raising state money by specific taxes, then this problem would be solved.

A large item in the city tax bill is the debt service. And the rural dweller should not be expected to

help pay debts incurred to give city dwellers services not extended to the rural dweller except as those services are extended to his home.

The difference between city and county taxes illustrated above does not represent a true picture of the cost of government. About 43 per cent of city taxes goes for debt service while the county has a deficit of about one million dollars in its general fund—this fund is obtained by a mandatory levy of twenty-five cents on each tax dollar, which may not be exceeded. Under a home rule charter the mandatory levies set up in the constitution would be inoperative and the county could apportion its tax collections as need demanded. This would obviate accumulation of unneeded funds for highway building and other uses if a tax rate were fixed high enough to meet the needs of the general fund.

It is interesting also to note that while the county accumulates floating indebtedness the city is retiring its indebtedness rapidly. City Manager James W. Aston says it will be possible for Dallas to clear all of its indebtedness and be on a pay-as-you-go basis within thirty years. Even while he is making this asser-

tion a reduction in the Dallas tax rate is contemplated. Thus it may be seen that the difference between city and county taxes will be gradually reduced and make less difficult the fixing of tax differentials which would make merger attractive to the rural areas.

The 1938 population of Dallas County was estimated at 344,000. It will probably run well over 400,000 under the new census. The 1930 census gave the city of Dallas 260,000 population. It will probably be 350,000 under the new census. Thus it is apparent that only a small proportion of the population lives outside the corporate area which pays both city and county taxes. Moreover, the number of incorporated cities and villages outside Dallas cuts this down still further. To be sure, a great deal of farm land is owned by city and village dwellers.

Inevitably, the day is coming, and perhaps soon, when a merger of city and county government may be possible. But it is quite likely that before merger is effected a home rule charter, under which the county will have a streamlined government, with a county manager and a short ballot, will be in effect.



# Denver Consolidation a Shining Light

*City-county unification stands up under test of time; represents "the ideal toward which the people of a metropolitan community should ultimately aim."*

By MAYO FESLER, Director  
*The Citizens' League of Cleveland*

IF ANY citizen is seeking an illustration of the advantages which city-county consolidation brings to an urban community, all that he needs to do is to visit Denver, Colorado, inquire closely into the administration of her unified city and county government, and talk with her business men and citizens as the author of this article has done.

The advantages are apparent in the city of Denver in many ways: in the organization of the government for administrative purposes, the generally high quality of her administration, the relatively low cost of her city-county government, the ease with which the voters can have a full understanding of their government, and the settled satisfaction of her people with the economical and efficient administration of local affairs in the city-county.

One can approach a critical examination of Denver's government from whatever point of view desired and the evidence of its general high quality is there. Analyze budget appropriations and expenditures and only two budgets will be found, the city-county budget and the school budget. Even in the days of the depression the city-county budget was kept in balance, because with one government and one budget real control could be exercised. Compare the

personnel by departments with other cities and it will be found generally less in numbers, because employees are used interchangeably by the departments. Examine the unified purchasing system which this centralized form of government makes possible, and the results obtained will be found to be uniformly satisfactory. The businesslike conduct of her water supply system will show a self-sustaining public utility, exceptionally well managed, on a sound financial basis, and with adequate funds to permit an expansion under great engineering difficulties.

## CITIZENS WELL SATISFIED

In short, this consolidated, highly centralized, but simple form of administration set up in Denver's home rule charter has resulted in giving the city and county of Denver for a period of nearly twenty-five years, an economical, efficient, and well balanced government—so satisfactory to her people that there is practically no demand for a change—although, to an outsider, some changes might seem to be desirable.

We do not mean to imply perfection in this situation. Democracy has not yet advanced to a state of perfection in Denver. The merit system is not observed. The spoils system still prevails in appointments.

The budget is not in the best form: it could be greatly improved. And there is, no doubt, inefficient administration in many places not apparent to the average citizen. But a general survey of her government convinces one that Denver holds high place among local governments in this country in her ability, under centralized government, to give economical and efficient administration.

#### CONSOLIDATION SECURED

In the period prior to 1900, Denver was suffering from the same ills which then plagued most American cities, in that it was being used as a pawn in the political game by partisanly controlled legislatures. Frequent changes were made by the legislature in its form of government without consulting the wishes of the authorities or the people of Denver. In 1893 the legislature had given the city a board or semi-commission form of government in an effort to free its administration from partisan control, inspired by well entrenched public utility interests. But it worked badly at best, so badly that in 1901 there was enough public sentiment against it to enable the leaders to secure submission of a constitutional amendment (art. XX), which was adopted in 1902. This amendment gave the city not only municipal home rule but consolidated the city and county into a single municipal corporation to be known as the City and County of Denver. The boundaries of the city and county were made coterminous, all city and county administrative offices were combined, and the people of Denver were authorized to elect a charter com-

mission to frame a new city-county charter of its own.

#### THE COURTS INTERFERE

The story of the struggle in the courts, and the efforts of its opponents to have this consolidated plan of local government declared unconstitutional, is an interesting story in itself, but it is not germane at this time. Suffice it to say that after some fifteen years of litigation and a complete reversal on the part of the Colorado Supreme Court in two major cases, the courts finally sustained the amendment in 1916 and the city found itself at last entirely free to adopt its own charter and to administer its own local city and county affairs without interference from the legislature.

#### ROBERT W. SPEER AS MAYOR

One of the mayors in that period of change, who had much to do with the later development of Denver and its present effective charter, was Robert W. Speer, who held office for two terms beginning with 1904. In 1916, at the time of the final ruling of the courts holding that Denver was free to frame a charter of its own consolidating the city and county into a single municipal corporation, Mr. Speer was out of the municipal picture but active in state politics. The city had been experiencing the failure of the commission form for a period of three or four years, so a group of business and professional men urged former Mayor Speer to run again for the office of mayor. He consented to do so, but only on condition that the people would approve a charter which he himself

would write, and which would name him in the charter as the first mayor under the new consolidated government. This, he said, would enable him to complete the task which he had begun back in 1904-12 and which he was unable to complete because of the changes in politics. His conditional requirement was accepted and the charter was framed in conformity with his ideas.

The charter was vigorously attacked as a scheme of the former mayor to establish a dictatorship. It did centralize administrative authority in the mayor as probably no other city charter in the country had done up to that time; but the people had such confidence in their former mayor, or at least he was so strong politically, that they adopted the charter which called for the appointment of Mr. Speer again as mayor.

#### CITY-COUNTY CHARTER

The major features of this new plan of government were briefly as follows:

a. A city-county consolidated unit with boundaries coterminous—the remainder of the original large county being left intact as the county of Arapahoe.

b. A complete consolidation of city and county functions and offices, and the abolition of all county administrative offices except that of sheriff, which was a constitutional office not abolished by the constitutional amendment.

c. The consolidation of twelve separate school districts in the county into one district, with boundaries coterminous with the county, but administered by a school board separate from the city-county government.

d. A city council of nine members elected on a nonpartisan single

choice ballot from single-membered districts.

e. An elected mayor with authority to name the "managers" (directors or heads) of five major departments, and the subordinates in all departments and offices.

f. The five departments are:

- (1) Department of Revenue,
- (2) Department of Improvements and Parks,
- (3) Department of Health and Charity,
- (4) Department of Safety and Excise,
- (5) Department of Law.

g. Several commissions and boards such as art commission and library board, appointed by the mayor.

h. A separate water board, appointed by the mayor. The water system was purchased from a private company some years after the charter was adopted.

i. An independently elected auditor to keep all accounts, scrutinize all expenditures and audit the books of all departments.

j. Initiative, referendum, and recall provisions.

k. No civil service provisions except for the police and fire departments.

The charter is not, of course, a model document in all respects; yet the framework of the new government was constructed on sound administrative principles, and it has worked so satisfactorily that there is no demand for any substantial change. Even when it was suggested that Denver was an ideal city for the most effective use of the city manager plan of government, the reply was, "We have in effect a city manager government only we elect the manager."

Mayor Speer, in framing the charter, was guided by the principle



which he enunciated in the following words:

I believe in the concentration of all administrative power in the hands of one official. It fixes the responsibility for good or bad government, for then you know whom to praise and whom to blame. Large powers can safely be granted where you have a recall in the hands of the people.

Mayor Speer was one of those vigorous, constructive municipal statesmen who once in a generation come to the political front out of a sense of duty or sheer loyalty to his city, or because of his interest in politics, and leaves a deep impress on the future of the city.

Unfortunately, he lived only two years after the installation of his charter; but his work was so well done, and the principles which he established have been so firmly imbedded in administration, that others are carrying on the work which he inaugurated. He embodied what he had preached and practiced when he said:

One of the most neglected ways in which people can make themselves bigger and better is by helping to make the city in which they live more attractive.

He has certainly done that, as the evidence will show in the form of extensive parks, dignified public buildings, an attractive civic center, and municipal statuary on every triangle. The new courthouse and city hall, over whose portals are the words, "The City and County of Denver," embodies the spirit of this centralized community control.

#### OPERATING COSTS

But after all, the test of the qual-

ity of any form of government is found in its practical operation. And the first question propounded by the taxpayer is "does it operate economically?" This is always a relative question, and can never be answered catagorically. The functions which the city performs, the area over which they are performed, and the handicaps in the way of their performance must be taken into consideration—for example, Denver had to tunnel through a mountain to obtain an adequate water supply and the city-county maintains a magnificent system of mountain parks of 15,000 acres. However, business men and active members of civic and commercial organizations consulted were all agreed that relatively speaking, Denver's city-county government is economically administered. The chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Tax Expenditure Committee, R. B. Mayo, president of a prominent auditing firm, expressed it this way:

It is impossible to make an accurate statement of the savings resulting from consolidation, because we are too far away from the time when city and county were separate. But if we were to go back to the old separate city and county governments and place another government on top of our present city government, we would add, in my opinion, to our present costs just about the cost of that additional layer of government. Our present form is so much better that an additional layer of government would be sheer waste.

Mr. Mayo's statement was confirmed by similar statements from a score of officials and informed citizens.

An attempt was made in 1917, one

year after the Speer charter went into effect, by Professor William B. Guthrie of the College of the City of New York, to estimate "Relative Expenses Before and After Consolidation." His figures showed a total operating expenditure of the county administrative offices to have been \$679,100 in 1911, when consolidation first took effect; and the 1917 appropriations for the administration of those same functions under the Speer charter to be \$476,600 or a reduction of about one-third in the cost of operation.

#### TRANSFER OF OFFICES AND FUNCTIONS

The following table will indicate how the offices and functions were transferred by the consolidation of city and county:

<i>County Administrative Offices and Functions</i>	<i>Performed By— Under Consolidation</i>
Five County Commissioners	President City Council Manager of Revenue, and Manager of Improvement and Parks
Denver County General Hospital	Manager of Health and Charity
County Coroner and Poor Relief	Manager of Health and Charity
County Roads and Bridges	Manager of Improvements and Parks
Sheriff and County Jail	Manager of Safety and Excise
County Treasurer	Manager of Revenue
County Assessor	Manager of Revenue
County Clerk and Recorder	City Clerk
County Attorney	City and County Attorney

County Surveyor      City and County Engineer

Practically all of these city-county officers to whom county functions were transferred are appointed by the mayor. Thus administrative control is effectively centralized.

Speaking of the benefits of simplification and consolidation, Mr. S. D. Wilson, research and tax consultant, formerly the city's chief accountant, said:

The city-county consolidation permits centralized budget control and results in a balanced budget. It also results in a clear and clean government, because responsibility for administration is fixed on one man, the mayor, and the voters know whom to hold responsible.

Mr. Wilson called attention to many of the economical features, especially the flexibility in the use of departmental employees. For example, the men in the department of revenue are used in assessing work in the spring. Then in the fall they are busy in the treasurer's office collecting taxes. There is departmental interchange of service in practically all departments.

Professor Clem Collins, Dean of the School of Commerce of the University of Denver, manager of revenue for eight years said:

Denver's city-county government is administered about as economically as it can be. The people like the centralized responsibility and authority because it affords a simple, direct, and easily understandable government to the average citizen.

Denver, a city-county of 320,000 population, has a highly centralized government—it is the ideal toward which the people of a metropolitan community should ultimately aim.

# Philadelphia's City-County Dilemma

*Eighty-six-year-old consolidation act so modified by later constitution and court decisions that the city-county needs new amendment for effective consolidation.*

By **FREDERICK P. GRUENBERG**

*Philadelphia*

While a Justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court once wrote: "The distinction between the county of Philadelphia and the city of Philadelphia is, from any point of view, of the most technical and shadowy kind, and . . . has no existence except in theory . . .,"<sup>1</sup> from the vantage of practical politics and from the aspect of better public administration the distinctions are often somewhat less than shadowy.

**O**F THE half-dozen city-county consolidations in the United States usually regarded as more or less effectively accomplished, the unification of Philadelphia is an early example. The legislative act which accomplished the consolidation is over eighty-six years old,<sup>2</sup> and while it has been amended here and there through the years, it still stands as the law.<sup>3</sup>

To understand the Philadelphia

<sup>1</sup>Minority opinion of Mr. Justice Mitchell in *Commonwealth v. Oellers*, 140 Pa. 457 (1891), p. 472.

<sup>2</sup>Act of February 2, 1854, P. L. 21.

<sup>3</sup>For a more complete discussion of this problem see *The City & County of Philadelphia, A Discussion of Their Legal Relations*, by Clarence G. Shenton, Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, 1923. Although a few minor changes have occurred since its publication, this compact little volume is an excellent guide to the reader desiring fuller information on the subject.

situation it must be made clear initially that the act of consolidation was passed by the Pennsylvania legislature prior to the adoption of the present state constitution which became effective in 1874. Prior to the 1874 constitution the General Assembly had the power to pass special and local laws. Hence, the act of 1854 applied specifically to Philadelphia. Under the constitution as it now stands, however, the power of the legislature to pass special and local laws is sharply restricted so that under the "new" constitution, legislation applicable solely to Philadelphia avoids the stigma of "special and local law" by being made to apply to cities or to counties of the first class—of which classes Philadelphia has always been the only member.<sup>4</sup>

The constitution of 1874 also enumerated a string of county officers,<sup>5</sup> which was considered later as having the effect of undoing those provisions of the act of consolidation which had abolished the county com-

<sup>4</sup>Philadelphia and Pittsburgh are both school districts of the first class. School districts are largely autonomous tax-levying local governments a fuller consideration of which is not possible in this brief paper, and is not essential to this discussion.

<sup>5</sup>Constitution of Pennsylvania, Art. XIV, sec. 1.



missioners, county treasurer, and county controller in Philadelphia. Later the legislature provided that "the . . . city treasurer, city controller, city commissioners shall be severally regarded as county officers."<sup>6</sup> This was later construed by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court which said that the constitution of 1874 had made county officers of the "city" treasurer and the "city" controller.<sup>7</sup>

The county functionaries continue to serve the city as well as the county, and no legislative action or judicial interpretation has gone so far as to deprive the city council of its rôle as tax-levying and appropriating body for the consolidated city-county, which functions the act of 1854 vested in the city councils—then a two-chambered municipal legislature, later replaced by a single city council by the present Philadelphia charter.<sup>8</sup>

The same act of 1854 made all debt of the county the city debt, as well as making all property of the county the property of the city. On the whole, the act of consolidation was a well conceived, well drafted measure which if not later modified would have made as complete a job of city-county consolidation as could reasonably be desired.

As the primary fiscal functions of tax-levying, appropriations, and debt are unified why has there long been agitation in Philadelphia for more effective city-county consolidation?

There are a number of reasons, but

the outstanding criticisms of the present city-county status are these:

- (1) Absence of centralized administrative control;
- (2) Limitations, real or presumed, on fiscal control of county departments;
- (3) Inability to apply the merit system and centralized purchasing to the county departments.

#### ABSENCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL

Philadelphia's city government has for over fifty years operated under a strong-mayor plan. The Bullitt charter of 1885 corrected the diffusion of administrative responsibility and the present Woodward charter of 1919 retained the strong-mayor features. The county departments, however, are headed by numerous separately elected officials who, while receiving their appropriations from city council, based on budget estimates submitted through the mayor, are protected by state laws giving them wide discretion on their personnel and in many cases fixing mandatory salaries.

While the mayor is the head of the combined city-county government, and the council the sole local legislative body, the tendency has been to regard the county officials each as coördinate with rather than subordinate to the municipality's chief executive. The majority of the county officials perform purely ministerial functions and have little or no policy-determining character, so there is no argument for their present popular election and the incidental disadvantage of the long ballot is obvious.

<sup>6</sup>Act of March 31, 1876, P. L. 13, sec. 17.

<sup>7</sup>*Taggart v. Commonwealth*, 102 Pa. 354 (1883); *Commonwealth v. Oellers*, 140 Pa. 457 (1891).

<sup>8</sup>Act of June 25, 1919, P. L. 581.

Closely linked with the absence of administrative control is the real or presumed limitation on the fiscal control of the county departments by mayor and council. While the statutes providing for budget and appropriation procedures of the unified city-county government require the heads of county departments to submit their annual budget requests to the mayor, as is required of the heads of the city departments, and the mayor may make his recommendations to council when transmitting his executive budget, the actual treatment of county budgets has, as a rule, been different from that accorded city departments.

Due in part to statutes giving county departments wide powers to determine the number of their employees and to fix their salaries, and as stated above, to some instances of salaries in county departments fixed by state law, but more to a long tradition of acquiescence by mayors and councils, the financial and administrative autonomy of the county departments has continued through the years.

A merit system has applied to the city government (except for the Department of Receiver of Taxes) since 1906 with varying degrees of effectiveness during the years, and a rather well developed system of centralized purchasing exists for those departments known as city departments. These more modern techniques of administration do not apply to the county departments whose operations are not trammled by such considerations as selection of employees from civil service eligible lists, protection of their employees'

tenure from political interference, or prohibitions against political activity. Indeed, it is this very political freedom which exists in the county that explains the continuance of a distinction for which there can be no argument from the point of view of the taxpayer or from that of the administrator seeking to do a good job.

#### WHERE THE DIFFICULTY LIES

As has been pointed out, Philadelphia City and Philadelphia County were unified by a legislative act applicable to both city and county. Legislation enacted since the present constitution became effective has had to be circumspcctly worded so as not to offend the prohibition against local legislation. Hence we have had laws affecting counties of the first class and a considerable number affecting cities of the first class. Although Philadelphia is the only municipality concerned, it is never mentioned by name in these acts, and the draftsman must avoid a wording that would apply to a unified city-county.

For a long time Philadelphia citizens interested in better local government have felt that the distinction which has been kept alive between city and county has militated against efficiency, responsibility, and visibility. The best authorities agree that as the constitution stands little can be done to remedy the situation, even were the legislature so disposed.

In 1920 a commission was appointed by Governor Sproul to consider a program for complete constitutional revision. Dr. William

(Continued on Page 395)

# County Purchasing Methods Reviewed

*Recent questionnaire survey demonstrates that with few exceptions present county purchasing regulations leave much to be desired.*

By ROBERT A. MARTINO  
*National Bureau of Standards*

IN AN effort to obtain as much data as possible concerning purchasing methods employed by counties throughout the country, and in order to determine in what way the National Bureau of Standards can be of assistance to these tax-supported agencies in solving their purchasing problems, a questionnaire survey was undertaken several months ago.

The official in charge of purchasing in each of the 3,070 counties in the forty-eight states was sent a questionnaire requesting information on the establishment of a purchasing agency; method of appointing a purchasing agent, whether by civil service or otherwise; extent of purchasing for county agencies; indications as to whether purchases are made on contracts based on written specifications or by trade-name or brand; how standards and specifications are formulated; the adoption and use of specifications of national technical organizations and those of the federal government; arrangements made for testing samples submitted with bids and samples of deliveries; the maintenance of testing laboratories by counties; and the use made of the facilities of college or university testing laboratories.

A total of 1,177 replies were received from counties in every state of the union, except Delaware. Of

this number, 430 were not considered because of failure to give any information of value. The present report is based, therefore, on 747 returns from as many different counties, or approximately 25 per cent of the total number.

The survey shows that the delegation of authority given to counties to make purchases of equipment, materials, and supplies needed by them for the operation of their governments is derived from acts passed by the state legislatures.

In Alabama many of the counties are operating under the uniform system of accounting and reporting act passed by the legislature in 1935.

Replies from California indicate that twenty-one counties have established agencies in accordance with the state political code, which authorizes boards of supervisors in each county to employ a purchasing agent.

The Los Angeles County charter makes brief use of the authorization granted in the political code with reference to the establishment of a purchasing agent as a Los Angeles County officer. The Board of Supervisors of the county has in turn established a number of rules and regulations applying to the conduct of the purchasing agent. He is responsible only to the Board of Supervisors and no limitation is placed on



the amount, which can be purchased nor is detail established in the purchasing procedure.

Under the budget law of the state of Nebraska provision is made for the appointment of county purchasing agents, such appointment being discretionary with the county commissioners in each county. Of the state's ninety-three counties only one reported that it had appointed such a purchasing agent.

An act passed by the General Assembly of Tennessee in 1939 providing for centralization, consolidation, and coördination of county administrative affairs creates in all counties of the state having a population of not more than 10,200, nor less than 10,100 a board of county commissioners who shall perform certain specific duties including purchasing for county requirements.

#### STATE PROVISIONS

Commissioners' courts in Texas correspond to boards of county commissioners or supervisors of counties in other states. In some counties purchases are usually made by the county judge who is appointed by the court to do the buying. In other counties the buying is done by the county auditor in accordance with a state act governing counties.

The revised statutes of Utah (1933) relative to the creation of purchasing departments in counties states: "The board of county commissioners in each county having an assessed valuation in excess of \$100,000,000 may appoint a county purchasing agent to serve during the pleasure of the board at a compensation to be fixed by it."

From replies received it is evident that only two counties, Juab and Salt Lake, have actually established such purchasing agencies. In other counties the boards of county commissioners administer to the needs of the counties.

The acts of the General Assembly of Virginia enacted in 1932 with respect to county purchasing provide in part as follows:

The board of supervisors of every county in the state shall have power to employ a county purchasing agent or to designate some official or employee of the county to perform the duties herein provided, and to provide compensation for such service.

An act passed by the Wisconsin legislature relating to county officers acting as county purchasing agents states in part that the county board in each county:

Except in counties of a population of two hundred fifty thousand or more, may appoint a person or committee as county purchasing agent, . . . and such person or member of such committee need not be a member of the county board but may be the county clerk, county treasurer, or any other county officer, and make appropriations for . . . their services. . . . When the cost of such supplies exceeds sixty dollars, the said purchasing agent shall in such manner as he shall deem best to secure the attention of probable bidders, invite proposals of similar standard supplies of equal quality, and shall purchase from the lowest reliable bidder. In counties having a population of two hundred fifty thousand or more, purchases shall be made for any or all of the offices, boards, departments, and commissions of said county in such manner and by such agency as the county board shall by ordinance provide for.

Similar acts, passed by legislatures of states not mentioned, empowering county boards or officials to perform certain functions and duties with respect to county purchasing, are undoubtedly in existence.

In a number of counties the official board functions as a unit and at times acts independently but generally in conjunction with the county highway department and the board of education. In smaller counties, where the amount to be purchased is not large, the official board authorizes the heads of departments and institutions to make ordinary purchases for their respective units. More frequently, however, the board assigns to one of its own members, or other county official such as the county clerk or the county auditor, the task of buying on a part-time basis in connection with his regular work.

#### SUPERVISING BOARD APPOINTS

In more than six hundred separate counties scattered throughout every state in the union, purchases are made either by the county clerk or some other individual appointed by the supervising board, subject to the approval of the board, or by the board itself. Other counties which have submitted replies, numbering approximately five hundred, stated that no purchasing agency was maintained and that purchasing is done by the heads of individual departments or institutions, many of which are subject to the approval of the county supervising board.

Different procedures exist from state to state. In Arkansas, in counties which maintain county courts, the county judge is designated as the

official who does the buying for all purposes. Similarly, all purchasing for counties in Kentucky is under the supervision and control of county fiscal courts, and, in most instances, the county judge is authorized to make all purchases subject to the approval of the fiscal court.

Subdivisions corresponding to counties in other states are called parishes in Louisiana, the buying for which is generally done by or under the authority of the parish police juries.

Purchases in Oregon and West Virginia counties are made usually by the head of each department and approved by the county court in each county. In some cases the county court makes all purchases.

Centralized purchasing, defined by Dr. Russell Forbes, Commissioner of Purchase of New York City, as "the delegation to one office of the authority to buy supplies, materials, and equipment needed by all the operating branches of an organization," occurs in not more than seventy-five counties of the United States. From replies received California leads in the number of counties—eighteen—which have adopted centralized purchasing in accordance with the political code of that state. These are: Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Humboldt, Kings, Lassen, Los Angeles, Monterey, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Tulare, and Ventura.

In North Carolina county purchasing agents have been appointed in Beaufort, Cumberland, Davidson,

Durham, Guilford, Haywood, Robeson, Rowan, and Rutherford.

Under an act passed by the legislature of Wisconsin relating to county officers acting as purchasing agents, county boards have appointed purchasing agents in Green Lake, Iron, Kenosha, Marquette, Polk, and Washburn Counties. Racine and Sheboygan Counties have also appointed purchasing agents but their purchases are limited to materials and supplies needed for courthouse purposes.

In seven counties in Ohio a full-time or part-time purchasing agent is employed for the purpose of buying for county needs. These are Cuyahoga, Geauga, Hamilton, Lorain, Lucas, Mahoning, and Stark.

#### CITY AND COUNTY COMBINE

Perhaps the outstanding system of centralized purchasing in Ohio is in effect in Hamilton County. All purchases for all administrative departments and institutions of the county are handled by the purchasing department.<sup>1</sup> There are no laws in Ohio requiring centralized or coordinated purchasing by counties. The plan of Hamilton County is extralegal by resolution of the board of county commissioners, by approval of the city council of Cincinnati, and by the board of education, through a committee known as the Coördinating Committee of Hamilton County. This committee consists of the city manager of Cincinnati, the president of the board of county commissioners,

the president of the board of education, and a member of the board of trustees of the University of Cincinnati.

The counties of Crawford, Kent, Manistee, Saginaw, and Washtenaw in Michigan have employed full-time purchasing agents. In Iron County the chairman of the board of supervisors appoints a purchasing committee at each annual meeting. In Kalamazoo County the purchasing department, which is under the direction of the finance committee, purchases for all departments of the county which are not incorporated bodies in themselves.

Although the General Assembly of Virginia passed an act in 1932 with respect to county purchasing, replies received from this state show that only four counties have adopted centralized purchasing. Arlington County has made rapid progress in its system of centralized purchasing, installed some nine years ago. The other three counties which have made some progress are Fairfax, Henrico, and Roanoke.

Recognition should be given to the fact that a large number of counties in this country are small both geographically and in size of population. The establishment of a purchasing department and the maintenance of a purchasing agent in a majority of these counties might constitute an undue burden on the taxpayers.

Presumably, the General Assembly of Virginia took this fact into consideration in its act of 1932 relative to county purchasing wherein it stated that: "The board of supervisors of any two or more adjoining counties shall have power to appoint,

<sup>1</sup>See also "Coöperative Purchasing in the United States and Canada." By Charlton F. Chute, NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, October 1938.



in accordance with the provisions of this section, a joint purchasing agent."

No counties in Virginia have indicated in their replies that they have taken advantage of this plan. It would be interesting to note the effect in savings which a plan of this nature would bring to a group of counties adopting it.

In Alabama the counties of Henry, Jefferson, and Tuscaloosa reported that they maintain purchasing departments. In Tuscaloosa County a resolution adopted by the board of revenue in 1930 provides that no department of the county may buy anything but must send its requisitions to the purchasing agent who makes all of the necessary purchases. By an act of the state legislature, approved in 1935, Henry County created a purchasing agency "dealing with and having reference to all purchases" for the county.

In five counties in North Dakota—Burke, McHenry, Sheridan, Walsh, and Wells—purchasing boards or committees have been established, and all purchasing is centralized in these committees.

#### NEW YORK COUNTIES CENTRALIZE

Several counties in New York State have also centralized their methods of purchasing. In Chemung County a purchasing department was established by the county board with the appointment of a county agent who makes purchases for all departments. A similar setup is found in Chenango County, where the purchasing agent does the buying for all departments except highways. The same is true in Erie, Jefferson,

Madison, Oneida, Nassau, and Westchester. In Genesee County a purchasing committee operating under the direction of the board of supervisors handles all ordinary purchases for the county departments.

The Department of Purchase of the City of New York buys all materials, supplies, and equipment required by all the agencies of the five counties within Greater New York—New York, Kings, Queens, Bronx, and Richmond. This includes equipment and foodstuffs for the sheriffs' jails and office furniture and supplies as well as stationery for the various county offices.

Purchasing departments have also been established in several counties located in Arkansas, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, New Jersey, Oregon, Texas, and Utah.

Replies received from two-thirds of the counties in Vermont indicate that centralized purchasing is in effect in that state. Counties make known their requirements to the state purchasing agent who does practically all of the buying. Some purchasing is done by the county courts in each county, but it is limited solely to materials needed for repairs to jails and courthouses.

It has been noted that in a vast majority of counties individuals who have been given the duty of making purchases are appointed by the county supervising board or commission under the general authority granted to it by the state legislature. This also applies to persons who have been specifically appointed and designated by title to serve as county purchasing agents. In many cases the duration

of their appointment is indefinite, subject to the pleasure of the governing board. In a few cases appointment of county purchasing agents is made on either an annual or a biennial basis.

In counties which maintain the county manager form of government, the appointment of a county purchasing agent is usually made by the manager. This has a tendency to take the appointments of purchasing agents directly out of the realm of politics.

#### CIVIL SERVICE FOR AGENTS

There is no doubt that a good purchasing department with a competent personnel can effect real savings to an organization whether industrial or governmental. In recognition of this fact, several counties have established civil service rules and regulations for the appointment of competent non-political purchasing officers. Thus, by means of competitive examination, the county authorities are in an excellent position to select only those individuals who are qualified to fill these important positions. Counties indicating that their purchasing officials have been appointed in accordance with civil service rules and regulations are Jefferson County, Alabama; Alameda, Los Angeles, and San Diego Counties, California; Cayuga and Fulton Counties, New York, for county superintendents of highways; Hamilton and Stark Counties, Ohio; and Multnomah County, Oregon.

It is a significant fact that approximately 70 per cent of the 747 counties whose returns were considered reported the use of standards and

specifications on which to base contracts for purchases.

In more than 30 per cent of the counties either the county engineer, county auditor, or superintendent of highways drafts specifications, chiefly for road and bridge construction and materials therefor. In many counties purchases for county roads and highways are procured under specifications prepared by state highway departments.

Purchasing agents, purchasing boards, or committees prepare specifications for materials, supplies, and equipment in about 10 per cent of the counties reporting. The county board, or official designated by it, formulates the desired specifications in 32 per cent of the reporting counties. In a number of counties specifications are prepared by the various departments, and in others by technical officers in coöperation with the using agency.

Approximately 15 per cent of the counties state that they use federal specifications on which to base contracts for purchase, while 10 per cent employ standards and specifications prepared by national technical organizations. More than 20 per cent of the counties rely on trade brands or trade names as a guide to purchases. It should, of course, be borne in mind that certain counties indicated the use of some or all of the methods referred to, depending upon the nature of the commodity procured.

For a number of years, the National Bureau of Standards in an effort to assist tax-supported purchasing agencies—federal, state, county, and municipal—in solving their pur-

chasing problems has called attention to the specifications in use by the federal government.

The federal government is undoubtedly the largest single purchaser of goods in this country. Its purchases are made on the basis of federal specifications of which there are about 1,300 now in use. These specifications are prepared by more than seventy technical committees made up of men drawn from all branches of the government and working under the general direction of the Federal Specifications Executive Committee, Procurement Division, Treasury Department. The National Bureau of Standards takes an active part in the preparation of federal specifications (except for foods and drugs). In this way, the results of investigations and tests conducted by the bureau are made available to these technical committees in the formulation of federal specifications. Considered as a whole these represent the best group of commodity specifications thus far compiled.

#### USE OF TESTING FACILITIES

Comparatively few counties of the United States reported the maintenance by their own government of laboratories for testing and inspection of commodities, or the employment of commercial, university, or other laboratories for such purposes. Of the 162 counties representing twenty-eight states reporting the use of laboratories for testing commodities purchased by the county, fourteen maintain their own laboratories for conducting various kinds of tests, seventeen employ the services of com-

mercial testing laboratories, eighty-eight utilize the laboratory facilities of college or university laboratories, and forty-three employ their state highway laboratories mostly for tests and inspection of materials and equipment used in road construction.

Too few counties, evidently, are taking advantage of the testing facilities of tax-supported colleges or universities for determining whether commodities comply with requirements relative to quality and grades as specified in the contracts or with the specifications on which contracts are based.

It is conceivable that a coöperative arrangement could be effected whereby county agencies would call upon state-owned institutions to maintain necessary equipment to conduct certain kinds of analyses and tests. Such an arrangement would be looked upon by public officials in legislative assemblies as economically advantageous, and they would probably be willing to make suitable appropriations for purchasing the necessary equipment and for housing it in schools, the teaching staff of which could easily arrange to conduct tests for county purchasers, and be paid for such services.

In all probability, a number of state-owned colleges and universities do maintain equipment for testing but the counties are not making use of available facilities. There is no question but that the use of commodity acceptance testing will have a great tendency to lessen the evils of delivering second-grade or off-grade materials and at the same time bring about savings in money.

The results of the survey show



that with certain exceptions county purchasing methods leave much to be desired. Nothing can be gained from the rule-of-thumb method which prevails in a number of counties. On the other hand, much can be accomplished if counties would revise their present purchasing methods and place them on a businesslike basis. An ideal county purchasing department is one which has put into effect a centralized system of purchasing whereby all purchases for county needs are handled by the purchasing department headed by a competent purchasing agent, which maintains a library of current standards and specifications covering various classes of commodities, and which owns or can utilize proper laboratory facilities for the testing of deliveries to determine their compliance with the requirements on which contracts are based.

Naturally, there are limits to the feasibility and efficiency of a completely centralized purchasing system in small or sparsely settled counties.

The solution may lie in county consolidation, or in coöperative purchasing, whereby two or more adjacent counties would pool their requirements and purchase on joint contracts.

---

### PHILADELPHIA DILEMMA

(Continued from Page 387)

Draper Lewis, then dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School and now director of the American Law Institute, was secretary of that commission and did a large part of the technical work in drafting a program to overhaul a state constitution

already obsolete twenty years ago. Among other valuable services Dr. Lewis was able to obtain adoption by the commission of a well conceived article which would have effectively consolidated Philadelphia City and County. It is a matter of history that the labors of Governor Sproul's Constitutional Commission were brushed aside by the then dominant political forces of Pennsylvania.

To amend the existing constitution requires the passage of a favorable resolution by two successive legislatures and approval by the electors on referendum. An excellent proposal for constitutional amendment to consolidate city and county effectively was passed by two legislative sessions, but it was defeated in 1937 when submitted to the voters of the state. It is worth noting that the proposal was carried by better than three to two in Philadelphia, but was defeated by the adverse vote in other sections of the state.

Distractions due to conditions abroad, interest in the impending national elections, and a fairly general satisfaction in "reform" circles with the new administration of Mayor Lamberton combine to dull for the present any civic interest in improving the framework of Philadelphia's local government. There are no signs of activity for pressing a constitutional amendment making unequivocal consolidation of city and county possible, any more than just now there are indications of life in the movement for a new charter. But who can prophesy—events move rapidly and the occasion for civic revival may come from combinations of circumstances as yet undreamed of.

# The Bonded Debt of 272 Cities as at January 1, 1940

*American cities reduce their debt obligations by eighty-eight millions during past year; 1940 tabulation shows continued downward trend in municipal debt totals.*

By ROSINA MOHAUPT

*Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc.*

THE total gross bonded debt of American cities of over 30,000 population (excluding New York) is estimated to have been \$88,000,000 lower on January 1, 1940, than it was the previous year. The total bonded debt for the 310 cities over 30,000 population is estimated at \$8,467,139,000. There has been a definite downward trend in the debt of the larger cities since 1936—over 75 per cent of the cities reporting decreases.

There are many factors to account for this apparent economy in the capital structure of the larger cities. There has been a decline in the rate of growth of the large cities, both in population and in extension of boundaries. The rush to install municipal improvements in sections of the city which were destined to be only good pasture land has left many cities with considerable "improved" areas awaiting development and requiring no new municipal improvements. In most sections of the country, school population has declined so that expensive school buildings are not in such demand as formerly. The federal government, with its aid in public works programs, has lessened the necessity for large increases in debt. And, finally, the rising cost of government has not been accompanied by increased ability to support

it from available tax moneys, hence "economy" budgets have postponed expensive capital costs in favor of immediate salary and wage increases, extension of municipal services, and other more pressing immediate demands.

These conclusions are based on questionnaires received from 272 cities (16 of them Canadian) through the coöperation of public officials, governmental research bureaus, and chambers of commerce. As 238 of these cities also reported in 1939, the comparative tables are based on these comparable cities, not the larger number.

These tables are concerned solely with the debt burden of cities. There are frequent requests for information concerning the overlapping debt structure, but this is too complex a subject for a tabulation which is prepared solely from questionnaires. Certain factors, however, are considered to make the debt structure comparable in the different cities. For instance, in some states the school district debt is not an obligation of the city, but since this debt is usually considered as being based on the full faith and credit of the city, it is included to show figures comparable with other cities. The same situation arises in connection

with sanitary districts, park districts, and other *ad hoc* units which issue bonds independently, but for purposes which are usually considered a part of the municipal pattern. Whenever this type of debt involves overlapping districts, only the city's share is shown, based on estimates of the assessed values of the two areas. Footnotes have been liberally used to explain these situations.

#### CHANGE IN UTILITY DEBT TREATMENT

In past years there has been considerable difficulty in reporting the self-supporting utility debt. Because of different methods of bookkeeping in some cities, it has been difficult to determine whether the utilities were actually self-supporting from earnings on a basis comparable with other cities. In most cities utility debt is self-supporting and the change in presentation noted below makes no difference in the net per capita debt, but in a few, where officials reported the utilities as self-supporting one year and not self-supporting the next year, it was impossible to make valid comparisons. In other municipalities legal requirements made it necessary to show utilities either self-supporting or not, as the case might be, while in reality the opposite was true in many cases.

Accordingly, last year for the first time, for the sake of uniformity, all utility debt was deducted, whether it was self-supporting from earnings or not. The definition of a public utility, however, still constitutes a serious question. Are golf courses, municipal markets, swimming pools, stadiums, convention halls, and similar projects, public utilities? While such

enterprises may be self-supporting, they could hardly be considered utilities. For the purpose of this tabulation, these projects are considered "public service enterprises."

In this study, a public utility has been considered to be a commercial enterprise vested with a public interest, carried on by a unit of government, the operation of which can be separated from the purely governmental functions of the city. It must earn a considerable part of its overhead and operating costs from revenues based on a rate structure. This rather long definition restricts public utilities in this tabulation to water, light and power, gas, street railways, rapid transit, port and harbor facilities, docks and sewage disposal plants. Other self-supporting enterprises are included under the general obligations of the city.

#### TREND OF DEBT

Table I which gives the total gross debt and net debt excluding utilities for all cities which reported both in 1939 and 1940 shows a definite decrease in the debt of American cities in the past year. This is further illustrated in Table II which gives the average per capita debt of each of the population groups, using 1930 population figures for both years.

The large increase of \$153,000,000 in the gross debt of New York City during the year influences the entire tabulation, and unless it is eliminated, counteracts decreases in 177 of the 238 cities (74.5 per cent) reporting in both 1939 and 1940. When this factor is eliminated, Table I shows that the gross bonded debt



TABLE I  
TOTAL GROSS AND NET BONDED DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1939-40  
238 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES (IN THOUSAND DOLLARS)

<i>Population Group</i>	<i>Gross Bonded Debt</i>		<i>Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities</i>	
	1939	1940	1939	1940
I	\$5,096,589	\$5,202,383	\$2,440,122	\$2,451,187
I <sup>a</sup>	2,599,154	2,551,980	1,564,251	1,520,151
II	720,538	725,221	490,591	494,728
III	1,290,014	1,300,357	875,430	856,596
IV	538,975	533,577	404,343	393,309
V	268,566	262,901	202,283	200,036
Total	7,914,682	8,024,439	4,412,769	4,395,856
Total <sup>a</sup>	5,417,247	5,374,036	3,536,898	3,464,820

<sup>a</sup>Excluding New York City.

TABLE II  
PER CAPITA GROSS AND NET DEBT EXCLUDING UTILITIES—1939-40  
238 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES

<i>Population Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Gross Bonded Debt</i>		<i>Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities</i>	
		1939	1940	1939	1940
I	20,828,542	\$244.67	\$249.77	\$117.15	\$117.68
I <sup>a</sup>	13,898,096	187.01	183.62	112.55	109.38
II	4,200,512 <sup>b</sup>	171.54	172.65	116.79	117.78
III	10,201,355	126.46	127.47	85.82	83.97
IV	4,681,349	115.13	113.98	86.37	84.02
V	3,083,360	87.10	85.26	65.60	64.88
Total	42,995,118	184.08	186.64	102.63	102.25
Total <sup>a</sup>	36,064,672	150.21	149.01	98.07	96.07

<sup>a</sup>Excluding New York City.

<sup>b</sup>Excluding Washington, D. C., which has no debt.

TABLE III  
CHANGE IN PER CAPITA DEBT BY POPULATION GROUPS—TWO-YEAR COMPARISON

<i>Population Group</i>	<i>Gross Bonded Debt</i>				<i>Net Debt Less Utilities</i>			
	1939-40		1938-39		1939-40		1938-39	
	In-crease	De-crease	In-crease	De-crease	In-crease	De-crease	In-crease	De-crease
I	\$5.10		\$3.11		\$ .53		\$ .41	
I <sup>a</sup>		\$3.39		\$3.75		\$3.17		\$3.21
II	1.11			3.65	.99			2.19
III	1.01			.14		1.85	.17	
IV		1.15	3.81			2.35	.19	
V		1.84		.68		.72	.25	
Total	2.56		1.46			.38	.06	
Total <sup>a</sup>		1.01		1.43		2.00		1.35

<sup>a</sup>Excluding New York City.

TABLE IV  
CHANGES IN GROSS AND NET DEBT BY NUMBER OF CITIES—1939-40  
238 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES

Population Group	Gross Bonded Debt			Net Debt Excluding Utilities		
	Increase	Decrease	Same	Increase	Decrease	Same
I	4	9		3	10	
II	6	5		6	5	
III	11	53		15	49	
IV	15	55	1	17	53	1
V	24	55		28	51	
Total	60	177	1	69	168	1

TABLE V  
RANGE OF PER CAPITA NET DEBT LESS UTILITIES  
250 AMERICAN CITIES REPORTING IN 1940<sup>a</sup>

Population Group	Per Capita Net Debt Less Utilities		Per Capita Net Debt Less Utilities	
	Three Highest	Three Lowest	Three Highest	Three Lowest
I	Buffalo, N. Y.	\$161.55	Milwaukee, Wis.	\$ 54.91
	Detroit, Mich.	153.28	San Francisco, Cal.	74.86
	Philadelphia, Pa.	152.49	St. Louis, Mo.	81.57
II	Newark, N. J.	184.61	Seattle, Wash.	63.83
	Jersey City, N. J.	169.01	Portland, Ore.	64.30
	Rochester, N. Y.	164.59	Indianapolis, Ind.	68.46
III	Yonkers, N. Y.	200.86	Spokane, Wash.	23.80
	Camden, N. J.	200.39	Fort Wayne, Ind.	26.83
	Knoxville, Tenn.	179.50	Tacoma, Wash.	28.22
IV	Atlantic City, N. J.	363.66	Saginaw, Mich.	10.41
	Asheville, N. C.	361.95	Lansing, Mich.	11.10
	New Rochelle, N. Y.	256.04	Wheeling, W. Va.	15.29
V	White Plains, N. Y.	302.88	Danville, Ill.	10.59
	Perth Amboy, N. J.	215.84	Arlington, Mass.	13.35
	Kearny, N. J.	139.32	Bay City, Mich.	16.86

<sup>a</sup>Miami and St. Petersburg, Florida, high per capita cities, did not report.

TABLE VI  
TOTAL GROSS AND NET BONDED DEBT LESS UTILITIES—1935-40  
215 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES (IN THOUSAND DOLLARS)

Population Group	Gross Bonded Debt		Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities	
	1935	1940	1935	1940
I	\$4,395,856	\$4,588,903	\$2,244,135	\$2,153,692
I*	2,008,636	1,938,500	1,352,750	1,222,656
II	732,718	725,221	484,934	494,728
III	1,278,221	1,283,531	885,993	843,308
IV	518,460	500,015	399,451	369,337
V	233,434	217,511	176,603	166,116
Total	7,158,689	7,315,181	4,191,116	4,027,181
Total*	4,771,469	4,664,778	3,299,731	3,096,145

\*Excluding New York City.

TABLE VII  
PER CAPITA GROSS AND NET DEBT  
215 COMPARABLE AMERICAN CITIES REPORTING IN 1935 AND 1940

<i>Population Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Gross Bonded Debt</i>		<i>Net Bonded Debt Less Utilities</i>	
		<i>1935</i>	<i>1940</i>	<i>1935</i>	<i>1940</i>
I	18,877,581	\$232.86	\$243.09	\$118.88	\$114.09
I*	11,947,135	168.13	162.26	113.23	102.34
II	4,200,512 <sup>b</sup>	174.44	172.65	115.45	117.78
III	9,983,519	128.03	128.57	88.75	84.47
IV	4,203,987	123.33	118.94	95.02	87.85
V	2,631,098	88.72	82.67	67.12	63.14
Total	39,896,697	179.43	183.35	105.05	100.94
Total*	32,966,251	144.74	141.50	100.09	93.92

\*Excluding New York City.

<sup>b</sup>Excluding Washington, D. C., which has no debt.

of the remaining 237 cities has gone down \$2.00 per capita and the net debt less utilities, \$1.35 per capita during the past year.

This year Group I cities (population over 500,000) again show the largest per capita decrease in both gross and net debt less utilities. Only three cities—New York, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh—show increases in debt. Group II cities (population between 300,000 and 500,000), on the other hand, have five cities with lower debt and six cities with higher debt figures than last year, with an average per capita increase in net debt excluding utilities of ninety-nine cents. This is the only group which reports an increase in the average net debt excluding utilities.

The issuance of some \$40,000,000 of utility debt in Memphis, Nashville, and Chattanooga, Tennessee, for the acquisition of power and light plants results in an increase of \$1.01 in the gross debt of Group III cities (population between 100,000 and 300,000). However, net debt less

utilities of this group shows a decrease of \$1.85.

The \$2.00 per capita decrease in the net bonded debt less utilities for American cities except New York City is the largest decrease reported since this tabulation was started eighteen years ago. In 1936 the first indication of the constant downward trend in bonded debt was found when a decrease of five cents was noted in the net debt. This was followed by yearly decreases of \$1.27, \$1.84, and \$1.35.

The pronounced downward trend over a period of years is further developed in Tables VI and VII which compare the debt in 1940 with the 1935 debt. Large decreases are indicated in all population groups except Group II (cities between 300,000 and 500,000). Perhaps the greatest change is shown in Group I cities (excluding New York), where the decrease is more than ten dollars per capita.

In the past, only cities with the highest and the lowest per capita



debt have been emphasized. This year the three highest and the three lowest are shown in Table V. This is done to indicate whether the highest and the lowest are far out of line with the remaining cities. In some groups several cities will be found near the top with per capita figures differing by only a few cents.

A word of caution should be spoken about Table V indicating the six cities with the highest and lowest per capita debt in each of the five population groups. Miami and St. Petersburg did not return their questionnaires and are not included in this year's tabulation. If they were, they would undoubtedly be the high cities of Groups III and V respectively. Often such resort cities or rapidly growing suburban developments are responsible for a high per capita debt, as in the case of Miami, St. Petersburg, Atlantic City, and White Plains. A factor which has played no small part in putting New

York and New Jersey cities at the top has been the large bond issues for relief. On the other hand, constitutional and legal limitations, as well as varying degrees of efficiency in governmental services, make possible the low per capita debts reported by some cities.

It is dangerous to conclude that a city with a low per capita debt is more efficiently and economically managed than one with a higher debt burden. Sometimes economy is enforced by legal and economic restrictions over which the local officials have no control. Sometimes high debt is incurred to provide facilities which, it is hoped, will attract a larger population with a lower per capita debt burden resulting in the future. The age, the topography, the tradition of "essential services," and many other factors, have so much effect that comparisons between cities are not only invidious, but dangerous.

(See following pages for tabulation by cities.)

# BONDED DEBT OF 72 CITIES AS AT JANUARY 1, 1940

Compiled by the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, Inc.  
From Data Furnished by Members of the Governmental Research Association, City Officials, and Chambers of Commerce

GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT				GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
Census 1930	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Im- provement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City	Obligation
<b>Group I</b>													
<b>Population 500,000 and over</b>													
1 New York, N. Y. <sup>1</sup>	\$ 6,920,446	\$ 360,950,569	\$ 1,481,443,979	\$ 2,650,402,608	--	--	54	\$ 2,134,148,467	\$ 931,036,194	\$ 134.34	\$ 162,934,750	100	
2 Chicago, Ill. <sup>2</sup>	3,276,438	282,477,745	35,751,500	321,379,245	66	34	31	305,542,817	302,392,817	89.55	16,561,148	--	
3 Philadelphia, Pa. <sup>3</sup>	1,956,961	342,744,162	80,511,000	190,225,138	53	16	31	432,218,436	297,495,298	152.49	N	0	
4 Detroit, Mich. <sup>4</sup>	1,568,662	175,998,039	66,421,000	124,790,739	10	10	90	346,693,777	240,439,436	153.28	800,000	100	
5 Los Angeles, Calif. <sup>5</sup>	1,236,048	49,013,676	55,366,207	215,367,266	66	10	100	318,718,578	104,379,883	84.31	7,033,324	0	
6 Cleveland, Ohio <sup>6</sup>	900,429	50,283,582	9,861,125	23,136,000	63	7	30	113,471,065	93,116,772	103.41	2,193,098	100	
7 St. Louis, Mo. <sup>7</sup>	821,960	67,684,000	2,030,000	61,390,000	71	8	22	72,379,909	67,004,923	81.57	--	--	
8 Baltimore, Md. <sup>8</sup>	804,874	111,659,720	21,596,732	52,935,128	80	4	15	150,748,520	103,344,425	128.35	--	--	
9 Boston, Mass. <sup>9</sup>	781,183	67,849,900	7,851,000	76,244,700	23	12	65	129,254,837	67,783,178	86.77	N	--	
10 Pittsburgh, Pa. <sup>10</sup>	669,817	60,339,300	20,656,126	4,586,700	77	22	1	76,903,650	72,373,612	108.05	N	0	
11 San Francisco, Calif. <sup>11</sup>	634,324	34,845,500	12,645,000	103,976,000	N	N	N	151,466,500	47,490,500	74.86	921,000	0	
12 Milwaukee, Wis. <sup>12</sup>	578,249	36,903,974	4,823,000	2,820,000	93	7	0	34,567,518	31,749,518	54.91	N	0	
13 Buffalo, N. Y. <sup>13</sup>	573,076	82,024,559	12,584,250	16,196,329	31	N	69	104,250,557	92,580,475	161.55	114,600	100	
<b>Group II</b>													
<b>Population 300,000 to 500,000</b>													
14 Washington, D. C. <sup>14</sup>	486,869	No Bonded Debt	4,962,000	71,775,011	62	23	15	69,165,159	64,598,203	139.11	4,618,804	100	
15 Minneapolis, Minn. <sup>15</sup>	464,356	51,391,287	15,421,724	3,500,000	N	N	N	56,131,000	52,631,000	114.72	3,686,020	0	
16 New Orleans, La. <sup>16</sup>	458,762	45,527,000	7,104,000										

\* = Estimated.

N = None.

-- = Figures not available.

<sup>1</sup>New York City. General debt includes \$162,934,750 special assessment and \$32,300,000 home and emergency work relief bonds. School sinking fund included in general city. Of the utility debt, \$37,580,004 is self-supporting.

<sup>2</sup>Chicago. General debt includes \$96,292,700 park and \$94,097,045 sanitary district debt which is 84.4% of the total debt of the district. County debt of \$34,748,910 and forest preserve debt of \$11,743,750 not included although 82.2% of taxable value is in Chicago.

<sup>3</sup>Philadelphia. Of the utility debt, \$60,000,000 is estimated as being self-supporting.

<sup>4</sup>Detroit. Utility debt includes \$4,969,000 sewage disposal bonds not faith and credit of the city and \$21,447,000 light and power bonds not self-supporting.

<sup>5</sup>Los Angeles. General debt includes \$15,388,764, city's share of flood control debt; utility debt includes \$109,155,816, city's share of metropolitan water district debt.

<sup>6</sup>Cleveland. General debt includes \$2,965,000 light bonds serviced by taxation.

<sup>7</sup>St. Louis, Mo. Relief bonds of \$4,250,000 are actually serviced by municipal bridge tolls although they are a general city obligation.

<sup>8</sup>Boston. County debt of \$2,171,000 not included although city assumes full burden. City's share (approximately \$25,000,000) of Boston metropolitan district debt not included.

<sup>9</sup>Pittsburgh. Debt reported as of January 3, 1940.

<sup>10</sup>San Francisco. Does not include \$26,775,000, city's share of Golden Gate Bridge & Highway District debt (any deficit from operations is made up by taxes, 85% of which will be borne by San Francisco). General city debt includes \$1,620,000 airport bonds, not self-supporting.

<sup>11</sup>Milwaukee. General city debt includes \$6,938,679, city's share of relief bonds handled by county and \$12,988,795, city's share of metropolitan sewage district debt.

<sup>12</sup>Minneapolis. General city debt includes \$287,000 public market debt and \$6,697,000 sewage disposal debt, both full faith and credit of the city and both serviced through taxation.

<sup>13</sup>New Orleans. General debt includes water, sewer, and drainage bonds. Water debt (serviced through taxation) not available. Port of New Orleans debt (\$35,744,000) and Orleans Levee District debt of \$22,082,000 not included.

	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT				GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
	Census 1930	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Im-prove-ment		Public Util-ity	Total	Excluding Utilities		Per Capita	Per Cent Gen'l City	
						(per cent)	(per cent)			(per cent)	(per cent)			Utilities
17 Cincinnati, Ohio <sup>14</sup>	451,160	40,911,105	11,696,000	35,308,539	87,915,644	33	10	57	61,637,510	41,157,378	181.23	2,015,946	100	
18 Newark, N. J. <sup>15</sup>	442,337	79,976,852	17,587,200	20,594,000	118,195,052	50	33	17	99,047,718	81,658,600	94.61	—	—	
19 Kansas City, Mo. <sup>16</sup>	399,746	30,560,054	20,065,000	14,277,000	64,902,054	6	94	0	58,506,311	44,248,769	110.69	282,221	0	
20 Seattle, Wash.	365,583	15,849,000	7,712,000	49,926,000	73,487,000	100	100	N	73,261,860	23,335,860	63.83	17,392,444	0	
21 Indianapolis, Ind. <sup>17</sup>	364,161	19,781,637	9,711,000	7,816,000	36,711,637	25	70	5	32,524,651	24,931,493	68.46	1,305,549	—	
22 Rochester, N. Y. <sup>18</sup>	328,132	46,397,877	13,684,500	4,347,623	64,430,000	63	15	22	57,240,946	54,507,346	164.59	5,447,500	100	
23 Jersey City, N. J. <sup>19</sup>	316,715	45,263,833	11,678,500	13,638,255	70,580,588	27	52	21	63,446,054	53,529,390	169.01	N	0	
24 Louisville, Ky.	307,745	31,335,400	10,966,400	1,079,000	43,380,800	89	N	11	34,934,176	34,725,707	112.84	N	0	
25 Portland, Ore. <sup>20</sup>	301,815	17,543,957	5,148,544	15,055,000	37,747,501	52	N	48	31,458,465	19,405,484	64.30	3,006,569	0	
Group III														
Population 100,000 to 300,000														
26 Houston, Tex. <sup>21</sup>	292,352	29,883,000	10,613,250	1,170,000	41,666,250	59	24	17	35,717,725	35,580,749	121.71	N	0	
27 Toledo, Ohio <sup>22</sup>	290,718	24,154,754	13,313,500	4,461,000	41,929,254	57	39	4	39,062,563	34,725,226	119.45	562,045	100	
28 Columbus, Ohio	290,564	19,781,380	6,021,049	5,183,000	32,402,429	46	31	23	25,641,731	22,002,247	75.72	4,182,279	100	
29 Denver, Colo. <sup>23</sup>	287,861	15,713,160	6,345,500	25,010,600	47,069,260	18	N	82	45,876,798	21,846,026	76.05	3,611,800	100	
30 Oakland, Calif. <sup>24</sup>	284,063	Not Reported												
31 St. Paul, Minn. <sup>25</sup>	271,606	20,250,000	9,808,000	6,585,000	36,643,000	—	—	22	29,792,880	24,702,046	90.95	6,000,000	—	
32 Atlanta, Ga.	270,366	8,340,000	3,987,500	1,987,000	14,314,500	67	11	11	12,894,920	11,065,400	40.93	579,500	100	
33 Dallas, Tex.	260,475	19,381,000	7,230,500	11,072,000	37,683,000	51	11	38	34,835,469	23,835,254	95.35	N	0	
34 Birmingham, Ala. <sup>26</sup>	259,678	13,810,000	8,267,000	4,000,000	26,077,000	—	—	—	22,692,286	18,692,286	71.98	290,000	100	
35 Akron, Ohio	255,040	24,427,967	5,129,451	9,203,172	38,760,590	7	15	78	36,350,948	29,031,859	113.83	1,542,700	100	
36 Memphis, Tenn.	253,143	15,759,000	5,599,000	25,633,000	46,991,000	55	22	23	44,772,215	19,639,149	77.58	446,000	100	
37 Providence, R. I.	252,981	36,633,500	12,523,600	18,000,000	67,156,500	47	18	35	50,374,489	38,141,894	150.77	N	0	
38 San Antonio, Tex. <sup>27</sup>	231,542	14,125,000	6,487,000	5,959,000	26,571,000	63	22	15	25,836,102	19,985,102	86.31	N	0	
39 Omaha, Neb.	214,006	9,349,430	8,310,500	4,223,000	21,882,930	18	32	50	16,456,673	14,926,673	69.75	2,635,070	0	
40 Syracuse, N. Y. <sup>28</sup>	209,326	24,433,150	5,513,017	4,979,250	34,925,417	N	N	N	N	29,946,167	143.06	295,000	100	
14Cincinnati. General debt includes \$544,000 airport bonds. Rental of Cincinnati Southern Railway is sufficient to provide debt service on an additional \$13,000,000 debt.														
15Newark. General debt includes subway, airport, port, and dock bonds of approximating \$21,000,000 which are financed through taxation.														
16Kansas City. Does not include \$800,000 Missouri River Bridge bonds in litigation which may be taken over by the state for retirement. Utility debt is not self-supporting.														
17Indianapolis. General debt includes \$5,172,236, city's share of poor relief debt issued by five townships in Indianapolis.														
18Rochester. General debt includes \$4,500,000 tax revenue and \$5,447,500 special assessment bonds; \$1,992,377 notes and contracts not included.														
19Jersey City. Debt as of February 29, 1940.														
20Portland, Ore. General debt includes \$1,705,000, city's share of Port of Portland by revenue.														
21Houston. General debt includes \$745,000 convention hall bonds serviced from revenue.														
22Toledo. Library debt of \$1,050,000 included in school debt. General debt includes \$4,396,000 general fund deficiency bonds.														
23Denver. General debt includes \$8,168,160 Moffat Tunnel District debt financed through taxation.														
24Columbus. Light and power debt of \$595,000 is not self-supporting.														
25St. Paul. School and general city sinking fund combined equal 78% of total.														
26Birmingham. Debt as of February 1, 1940.														
27San Antonio. Debt as of April 1, 1940.														
28Syracuse. General debt includes \$85,000 municipal stadium bonds supported by revenue.														



## GROSS BONDED DEBT

## SINKING FUNDS

## NET BONDED DEBT

## SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS

Census 1930	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Im- prove- ment (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation
41 Dayton, Ohio. <sup>20</sup>	200,982	8,144,515	5,634,876	3,166,000	16,945,391	85	N	15	2,152,419	11,944,532	59.43	639,370
42 Worcester, Mass.	195,311	10,428,000	60,000	2,380,400	12,868,400	N	N	N	12,868,400	10,488,000	53.70	1,341,000
43 Oklahoma City, Okla.	185,389	7,844,100	5,292,523	4,011,200	17,147,823	34	20	46	11,748,845	10,199,445	55.02	1,955,755
44 Richmond, Va. <sup>20</sup>	182,929	25,302,814	7,000,546	7,747,740	40,141,100	63	16	21	25,075,573	20,574,238	112.47	N
45 Youngstown, Ohio	170,002	9,594,180	1,801,000	662,000	11,997,180	—	18	—	11,296,991	10,634,991	62.56	262,000
46 Grand Rapids, Mich. <sup>21</sup>	168,592	5,568,240	1,740,221	5,055,000	12,363,461	30	N	70	10,296,461	6,694,461	39.71	1,189,000
47 Hartford, Conn. <sup>22</sup>	164,072	15,577,000	5,109,000	2,260,000	22,946,000	50	37	13	20,240,704	18,328,354	111.71	N
48 Fort Worth, Tex.	163,447	12,974,000	6,502,500	7,496,000	26,972,500	32	65	3	25,418,238	17,966,238	109.92	N
49 New Haven, Conn.	162,655	13,328,000	298,000	N	13,626,000	92	8	N	12,733,222	12,733,222	78.28	N
50 Flint, Mich.	156,492	5,789,859	5,377,000	1,756,500	12,923,359	25	44	31	9,639,939	8,902,629	56.89	784,000
51 Nashville, Tenn. <sup>23</sup>	153,866	9,770,000	3,984,000	18,025,000	31,779,000	—	N	N	1,750,652	12,003,348	78.01	25,000
52 Springfield, Mass.	149,900	8,951,500	N	5,878,000	16,500,000	N	N	N	16,658,500	10,780,500	71.92	N
53 San Diego, Calif. <sup>24</sup>	147,995	2,633,806	3,513,625	12,606,134	18,753,565	N	N	N	18,753,565	6,147,431	41.54	N
54 Bridgeport, Conn.	146,716	10,818,000	2,862,000	N	13,680,000	N	N	N	13,680,000	13,680,000	93.24	N
55 Scranton, Pa.	143,433	2,140,000	6,241,000	N	8,381,000	31	69	N	8,268,279	8,268,279	57.65	576,528
56 Des Moines, Iowa	142,559	6,199,815	6,722,500	4,178,000	17,100,315	N	N	100	16,632,221	12,922,315	90.65	—
57 Long Beach, Calif. <sup>25</sup>	142,032	6,026,169	8,324,500	24,186,160	38,536,829	N	N	N	38,536,829	14,350,669	101.04	—
58 Tulsa, Okla. <sup>26</sup>	141,258	7,719,024	4,681,390	3,019,500	15,419,914	—	35	—	11,359,834	8,340,334	59.04	0
59 Salt Lake City, Utah	140,267	2,979,000	3,761,000	4,227,000	10,967,000	87	13	N	10,482,303	6,255,303	44.60	227,700
60 Paterson, N. J.	138,513	10,156,364	5,459,600	13,196,000	28,811,964	—	—	—	27,748,216	14,552,216	105.06	—
61 Yonkers, N. Y.	134,646	19,505,600	7,540,100	5,252,000	32,297,700	N	N	N	32,297,700	27,045,700	200.86	1,722,600
62 Norfolk, Va. <sup>27</sup>	129,710	18,742,438	6,347,535	14,523,227	39,613,200	—	43	—	25,135,640	16,774,594	129.32	N
63 Jacksonville, Fla. <sup>28</sup>	129,549	5,400,500	3,966,000	4,039,500	13,446,000	37	63	N	12,430,126	8,390,626	64.77	727,000
64 Albany, N. Y.	127,412	14,818,450	4,727,650	13,213,000	32,759,100	100	N	N	31,176,968	17,963,968	140.99	290,000
65 Trenton, N. J.	123,365	11,475,760	6,179,963	1,178,800	18,834,523	25	46	25	17,342,971	16,542,908	134.11	25,000
66 Kansas City, Kans.	121,857	4,088,098	2,952,000	4,148,000	11,188,098	6	N	94	8,573,613	6,891,667	56.56	208,702
67 Chattanooga, Tenn. <sup>29</sup>	119,798	13,043,600	2,074,000	13,200,000	28,317,600	—	—	—	27,549,862	14,349,862	119.78	1,328,972
68 Camden, N. J.	118,700	21,240,793	3,898,000	1,143,550	26,282,343	63	30	7	24,835,894	23,785,998	200.39	N
69 Erie, Pa.	115,967	4,858,000	4,879,110	1,260,000	10,997,110	100	N	N	10,857,498	9,597,498	82.76	532,792
70 Spokane, Wash.	115,514	2,259,000	580,000	489,000	3,328,000	17	3	80	2,880,788	2,749,090	23.80	1,565,272

supporting.

<sup>20</sup>Long Beach. Utility debt includes \$13,796,410, city's share of metropolitan water bonds, \$5,278,750 harbor, \$2,245,000 water, and \$2,866,000 gas bonds.

<sup>21</sup>Tulsa, Allentown, Hamilton, Lorain. Division between city and utility sinking fund not available.

<sup>22</sup>Norfolk, St. Joseph, Winston-Salem, Roanoke, Plainfield. Division between school and general city sinking fund not available.

<sup>23</sup>Jacksonville. Utility debt includes \$2,165,000 dock bonds, not self-supporting.

<sup>24</sup>Chattanooga. Debt as of September 30, 1939.

<sup>25</sup>Dayton. General debt includes \$430,000 delinquent tax bonds and \$59,000 1932 deficiency bonds, both payable from delinquent tax collections.

<sup>26</sup>Richmond. Debt as of January 31, 1940.

<sup>27</sup>Grand Rapids. Of the water debt, \$2,800,000 is a general city obligation, but entire \$5,055,000 is serviced from water earnings.

<sup>28</sup>Hartford. Debt as of January 5, 1940.

<sup>29</sup>Nashville. Utility debt includes \$15,000 electric power revenue bonds issued June 1, 1939.

<sup>30</sup>San Diego, Saginaw, Wheeling, Augusta, Lancaster. Utility debt is not self-

Census 1930	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS		NET BONDED DEBT		GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS			
	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Total	Gen'l Im- provement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Per City Obligation
71 Fall River, Mass.	115,274	4,246,000	904,000	5,448,000	326,000	100	N	N	5,122,000	4,824,000	41.85	N
72 Fort Wayne, Ind.	114,946	501,800	2,582,000	4,774,800	713,142	N	N	N	4,073,367	3,083,800	26.81	3,000,000
73 Elizabeth, N. J.	114,589	6,641,479	5,095,000	15,786,479	2,172,320	98	N	2	15,071,327	11,023,327	96.19	N
74 Cambridge, Mass.	113,643	9,279,500	1,533,000	11,484,500					9,312,180	8,687,316	76.35	N
75 New Bedford, Mass.	112,597	Not Reported										0
76 Reading, Pa.	111,171	3,452,000	6,726,000	12,561,000	372,590	51	4	45	12,188,410	9,974,360	89.73	345,000
77 Wichita, Kans. <sup>40</sup>	111,110	5,239,195	2,998,500	9,571,445					9,571,445	8,237,695	74.14	1,859,290
78 Miami, Fla.	110,637	Not Reported			28,812	100	N	N	12,886,133	3,014,688	28.22	729,275
79 Tacoma, Wash.	106,817	1,939,500	1,104,000	12,914,945	1,543,628	—	—	—	10,781,322	3,961,322	37.16	—
80 Wilmington, Del. <sup>41</sup>	106,597	4,648,950	856,000	6,820,000								100
81 Knoxville, Tenn.	105,902	18,994,738	2,063,000	4,672,303	25,730,041	87	N	13	23,361,814	18,990,986	179.50	100
82 Peoria, Ill. <sup>42</sup>	104,969	2,416,500	710,000	3,126,500	67,132	100	N	N	3,059,368	3,059,368	29.15	778,489
83 Canton, Ohio	104,906	3,946,312	4,493,000	664,000	9,103,312	51	49	N	7,131,705	6,578,705	62.71	325,190
84 South Bend, Ind. <sup>43</sup>	104,193	2,550,500	2,115,000	5,340,500	366,087	18	N	82	4,974,413	4,599,872	44.15	2,500,000
85 Somerville, Mass. <sup>44</sup>	101,463	3,418,275	1,473,000	5,084,275					5,084,275	4,891,275	47.07	—
86 El Paso, Tex.	102,421	3,265,914	1,925,000	1,607,000	498,786	63	27	10	6,299,128	4,741,030	46.29	218,500
87 Lynn, Mass. <sup>45</sup>	102,329	4,167,300	1,679,000	3,155,000	38,862	100	N	N	6,142,438	5,807,438	56.76	N
88 Evansville, Ind.	102,249	1,801,200	1,810,500	4,852,700	209,155	66	N	34	4,643,545	3,154,650	30.85	158,991
89 Utica, N. Y.	101,740	9,466,078	1,527,696	N	10,993,774	—	—	—	10,884,174	10,884,174	106.98	—
90 Duluth, Minn.	101,463	4,285,000	2,453,000	9,270,000					9,270,000	6,738,000	66.41	N
91 Tampa, Fla.	101,161	Not Reported										0
92 Gary, Ind. <sup>46</sup>	100,426	2,137,296	3,323,000	N	169,742	38	62	N	5,390,554	5,290,554	52.68	—
93 Lowell, Mass.	100,234	3,664,690	412,000	4,425,190					4,425,190	4,076,690	40.67	N
Population 50,000 to 100,000												
94 Waterbury, Conn.	99,902	10,062,500	1,142,000	17,420,500					17,420,500	11,204,500	112.15	N
95 Schenectady, N. Y.	95,692	9,118,000	1,172,000	10,591,000	90,015	95	N	5	10,203,985	10,203,972	106.63	651,000
96 Sacramento, Calif. <sup>47</sup>	93,750	3,620,680	6,198,000	3,703,000	13,521,680	N	N	N	13,521,680	9,818,680	104.73	545,489
97 Allentown, Pa. <sup>48</sup>	92,563	4,878,400	4,158,000	720,000	1,016,025	—	74	—	8,740,375	8,020,375	86.68	0
98 Bayonne, N. J.	88,979	Not Reported										0
99 Wilkes-Barre, Pa.	86,626	Not Reported										0
100 Rockford, Ill.	85,864	680,500	2,468,000	2,993,500	179,500	39	47	14	2,814,000	2,814,000	32.77	666,424
101 Lawrence, Mass. <sup>49</sup>	85,068	2,298,000	422,000	477,000					3,177,000	2,700,000	31.74	N
102 Savannah, Ga. <sup>50</sup>	85,024	4,028,000	495,000	4,643,000	235,500	100	N	N	4,407,500	4,387,500	50.43	0
103												
"Wichita. General debt includes \$1,599,000, city's share of county debt for welfare.												
"Wilmington, Del. Debt as of June 30, 1939. School bond redemption assumed by state legislature; city pays interest.												
"Peoria. General city debt includes \$1,380,000 sanitary district debt.												
"South Bend. General debt includes \$411,000 park board debt, and \$675,010 (city's share) township debt for relief.												
"Savannah. Debt as of March 31, 1940.												
"Somerville. Utility debt is not self-supporting.												
"Lynn. Does not include \$82,000 tax title loans.												
"Gary. General debt includes \$40,000 library debt.												
"Sacramento. Utility debt includes \$435,000 wharf bonds, not self-supporting.												
"Lawrence. General debt includes \$145,000 state tax funding loan issued in 1939 but not \$35,321 tax title loans. Utility debt is not self-supporting.												
"Savannah. Debt as of March 31, 1940.												

	Census 1930	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS			NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
		General Improvement		Public Schools		Total	Gen'l Im- prov- ment (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Util- ity (per cent)	Total		Total	Per Cent City Obligation
		5,923,895	1,347,000	2,972,605	10,243,500					62,385	374,398	9,869,102	1,590,926
103 Charlotte, N. C.	82,675			7,150,000	9,341,370		N	N	100	26.69	2,191,370	35,366	100
104 Berkeley, Calif. <sup>60</sup>	82,109	750,120	1,441,250										
105 Altoona, Pa.	82,054	Not Reported											
106 Little Rock, Ark.	81,679	Not Reported											
107 St. Joseph, Mo. <sup>61</sup>	80,935	4,315,000	2,646,000	N	6,961,000		N	N	N	84.52	6,840,424	—	83
108 Saginaw, Mich. <sup>62</sup>	80,715	466,000	374,000	2,010,000	2,850,000		N	N	N	10.41	840,000	267,193	
109 Harrisburg, Pa.	80,339	Not Reported											
110 Sioux City, Iowa	79,183	Not Reported											
111 Lansing, Mich.	78,397	976,000		943,000	1,919,000		11	N	89	11.10	870,000	N	0
112 Pawtucket, R. I.	77,149	10,171,000	3,403,000	2,763,000	16,337,000		50	34	16	148.21	11,434,361	—	—
113 Manchester, N. H. <sup>63</sup>	76,834	3,084,340	471,040	113,000	3,668,380		N	N	N	46.27	3,555,000	—	—
114 Binghamton, N. Y.	76,662	3,189,000	2,950,700	30,000	6,169,700		N	N	N	80.09	6,139,700	N	0
115 Shreveport, La. <sup>64</sup>	76,655	7,918,500	540,000	330,000	8,788,500		94	6	N	107.24	8,220,603	—	—
116 Pasadena, Calif.	76,086	3,023,614	2,897,720	6,000,536	11,921,870		N	N	100	77.82	5,921,334	2,502,823	0
117 Lincoln, Neb. <sup>65</sup>	75,933	950,750	3,080,500	1,747,000	5,778,250		7	N	93	52.61	3,995,480	145,902	100
118 Huntington, W. Va.	75,572	1,410,000	—	N	—		—	—	—	—	—	N	0
119 Niagara Falls, N. Y. <sup>66</sup>	75,460	8,204,255	6,833,210	1,552,930	16,590,395		N	N	100	199.28	15,037,465	189,823	0
120 Winston-Salem, N. C. <sup>67</sup>	75,274	8,745,456	3,509,858	2,551,686	14,807,000		—	—	18	159.01	11,969,432	212,000	100
121 East St. Louis, Ill.	74,347	Not Reported											
122 Troy, N. Y.	72,763	6,272,460	847,275	669,175	7,788,900		N	N	N	97.85	7,119,725	—	—
123 Quincy, Mass.	71,983	3,205,500	701,000	239,000	4,145,500		N	N	N	54.26	3,906,500	N	0
124 Springfield, Mass.	71,864	Not Reported											
125 Portland, Me.	70,810	Not Reported											
126 Lakewood, Ohio	70,509	1,919,760	2,122,500	112,000	4,154,260		90	10	N	51.12	3,604,179	15,980	100
127 Roanoke, Va. <sup>68</sup>	69,206	4,310,000	2,650,000	4,900,000	11,960,000		—	—	7	83.16	5,754,851	N	0
128 Springfield, Ohio	68,743	3,309,117	1,087,440	200,000	4,596,557		97	3	N	63.27	4,349,427	85,000	0
129 Mobile, Ala. <sup>69</sup>	68,202	5,423,818	—	3,897,000	9,320,818		N	N	N	79.53	5,423,818	3,421,567	100
130 New Britain, Conn. <sup>70</sup>	68,128	1,345,000	2,358,000	1,536,000	5,239,000		95	N	5	52.93	3,606,120	N	0
131 East Orange, N. J.	68,020	6,540,500	3,486,945	565,000	10,592,445		16	62	22	137.14	9,328,541	29,669	100
132 Racine, Wis.	67,542	2,462,000	1,021,000	1,021,000	4,509,000		100	N	N	49.95	3,374,000	71,022	0
133 Johnston, Pa.	66,993	3,953,000	4,698,000	N	8,651,000		56	44	N	107.13	7,176,866	N	0

<sup>60</sup>Berkeley. Utility debt is city's share of East Bay Municipal Utility District debt.  
<sup>61</sup>Shreveport. Of the water bonds, \$53,000 are not self-supporting.  
<sup>62</sup>Shreveport. General debt includes \$73,000 sanitary district debt.  
<sup>63</sup>Lincoln. General debt includes \$73,000 sanitary district debt.  
<sup>64</sup>Niagara Falls. School debt includes \$1,415,000 overlapping debt, specifically excluded by the constitution when ascertaining the debt limit.  
<sup>65</sup>Mobile. Debt as of February 29, 1940. School debt included in general city debt.  
<sup>66</sup>New Britain. Revenue anticipation serial coupon notes due within five years of \$402,000 for WPA and \$170,000 due within four years for welfare not included.



Census 1930	General Improvement Schools	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Im- prove- ment (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Util- ity (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS Per City Obligation
66,602	Not Reported	Not Reported	2,175,000	26,248,600	N	N	N	26,248,600	24,073,600	363.66	—
66,198	24,073,600	—	2,827,000	9,824,000	N	N	N	6,997,000	6,997,000	105.89	—
66,079	2,332,000	2,332,000	619,000	6,328,000	N	N	N	6,328,000	6,328,000	87.46	2,511,000
65,276	3,901,000	1,808,000	2,231,000	4,298,000	N	N	N	4,298,000	2,067,000	31.68	—
65,252	1,503,000	564,000	2,231,000	4,298,000	N	N	N	4,298,000	2,067,000	31.68	—
64,928	3,226,250	2,203,275	1,445,000	6,874,525	47.421	89	11	5,382,104	5,382,104	82.89	1,257,000
140 Hammond, Ind. <sup>50</sup>	2,849,470	1,626,500	1,123,000	5,598,970	151,237	57	35	4,377,733	4,377,733	67.81	4,471,355
141 Topeka, Kans.	782,850	1,750,000	535,000	3,067,850	528,539	N	N	2,539,311	2,532,850	39.50	477,691
142 Oak Park, Ill. <sup>60</sup>	1,477,000	1,924,000	1,145,000	4,546,000	375,000	N	N	4,171,000	3,026,000	47.29	253,920
143 Brockton, Mass.	Not Reported	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
144 Evanston, Ill.	778,000	2,250,000	37,000	3,065,000	274,174	N	95	2,790,826	2,767,826	43.70	966,154
145 Passaic, N. J.	7,229,500	1,871,500	7,195,000	16,296,000	1,327,549	66	34	14,968,451	7,773,451	123.47	N
146 Terre Haute, Ind. <sup>61</sup>	962,500	600,000	N	1,562,500	53,306	N	100	1,509,194	1,509,194	24.03	N
147 Glendale, Calif.	Not Reported	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
148 Charleston, S. C.	4,638,500	749,000	4,460,000	9,847,500	988,925	13	20	8,858,575	5,063,429	81.32	316,000
149 Wheeling, W. Va. <sup>64</sup>	706,900	236,000	1,238,000	2,180,900	—	N	N	2,180,900	942,900	15.29	N
150 Mount Vernon, N. Y.	5,955,200	3,887,050	2,720,000	12,562,250	2,070,135	16	N	10,492,115	9,524,235	154.87	N
151 Davenport, Iowa	1,918,217	1,607,000	N	3,525,217	131,385	100	N	3,393,832	3,393,832	55.86	230,272
152 Charleston, W. Va.	Not Reported	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
153 Augusta, Ga. <sup>64</sup>	2,212,000	989,000	647,000	3,848,000	504,680	81	N	3,343,320	2,793,587	46.30	N
154 Lancaster, Pa. <sup>64</sup>	1,455,000	3,205,000	2,651,000	7,311,000	835,400	13	87	6,475,600	3,824,600	63.80	—
155 Medford, Mass.	2,745,000	941,000	440,000	4,126,000	20,000	100	N	4,106,000	3,666,000	61.39	N
156 Hoboken, N. J.	Not Reported	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
157 Chester, Pa.	5,634,350	1,589,000	N	7,223,350	362,068	93	7	6,861,282	6,861,282	116.97	9,000
158 Union City, N. J.	58,659	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100
159 Malden, Mass.	2,363,000	1,239,000	105,000	3,707,000	200,644	100	N	3,506,356	3,401,356	58.61	N
160 Madison, Wis. <sup>66</sup>	2,765,200	2,752,750	249,000	5,405,950	5,405,950	N	N	5,405,950	5,154,950	89.03	N
161 Bethlehem, Pa. <sup>66</sup>	1,540,500	2,355,000	2,850,500	7,146,000	909,289	1	99	6,236,711	3,886,211	58.49	—
162 Beaumont, Tex. <sup>62</sup>	57,732	1,943,638	2,497,250	8,944,388	402,138	37	24	8,542,250	6,203,250	107.45	N
163 San Jose, Calif. <sup>66</sup>	880,650	1,197,000	2,077,650	4,155,250	402,138	37	24	3,675,112	2,077,650	63.04	79,696
164 Springfield, Mo.	1,342,135	1,488,500	N	2,830,635	246,055	66	34	2,584,580	2,584,580	44.93	—
165 Decatur, Ill. <sup>66</sup>	57,510	1,350,000	681,300	2,184,200	83,200	100	N	2,102,000	1,949,000	33.89	900,000
166 Irvington, N. J.	56,733	Not Reported	153,000	—	—	N	N	—	—	—	0
167 Holyoke, Mass.	56,537	309,000	819,000	1,722,000	927,255	N	N	1,722,000	903,000	15.97	N
168 Hamtramck, Mich.	56,268	3,653,978	491,000	6,965,978	927,255	31	69	6,038,723	5,547,723	98.57	N
<sup>57</sup> Atlantic City. General city debt includes \$390,000 bonds issued in lieu of delinquent state taxes. School debt included in general city.											
<sup>58</sup> Montgomery. Debt as of February 29, 1940.											
<sup>59</sup> Hannond. General debt includes \$1,350,000 sanitary district debt and \$590,000 park district debt.											
<sup>60</sup> Oak Park. General debt includes \$682,000 park district bonds.											
<sup>61</sup> Terre Haute. General debt includes \$458,000 debt of park district which is independent of the city.											
<sup>62</sup> Decatur. General debt includes \$339,000 park district and \$425,000 sanitary district debt as of March 1, 1940.											
<sup>63</sup> San Jose. Debt as of December 1, 1939.											
<sup>64</sup> Beaumont. Special assessment notes of \$2,000 maturing serially not included.											
<sup>65</sup> Bethlehem. \$2,150,000 of utility debt are bonds issued by the Bethlehem Municipal Water Authority, a separate corporation.											
<sup>66</sup> Madison. Of the utility debt, \$99,000 is not self-supporting.											

	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS			NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
	Census 1930	General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Improve-ment (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Per City Obligation
169 Cedar Rapids, Iowa <sup>m</sup>	56,097	1,334,600	1,486,500	976,000	3,797,100	N	N	N	3,797,100	2,821,100	50.28	N
170 York, Pa.	55,254	1,957,500	1,933,000	N	2,460,500	61	39	N	2,638,616	2,638,616	47.75	0
171 Jackson, Mich.	55,187	1,518,000	1,322,000	1,264,500	4,104,500	N	N	N	4,104,500	2,840,000	51.46	100
172 Kalamazoo, Mich.	54,785	1,104,160	1,510,000	N	4,683,160	N	N	N	1,366,000	1,366,000	24.93	100
173 East Chicago, Ind. <sup>oo</sup>	54,784	1,104,160	1,510,000	2,069,000	4,683,160	N	5	95	4,271,172	2,594,160	47.35	—
174 McKeesport, Pa.	54,632	Not Reported	Not Reported	N	13,952,676	—	—	—	13,826,042	13,826,042	256.04	14,165
175 New Rochelle, N. Y.	53,829	8,913,000	5,039,676	40,000	1,739,000	N	—	—	1,739,000	1,699,000	31.56	—
176 Macon, Ga.	53,829	975,000	724,000	40,000	1,739,000	—	—	—	6,336,581	4,865,081	91.59	0
177 Greensboro, N. C.	53,569	Not Reported	Not Reported	1,471,500	6,406,500	—	—	—	2,232,478	2,138,576	40.76	100
178 Austin, Tex.	53,120	2,981,000	1,954,000	1,471,500	6,406,500	—	—	—	6,371,249	5,873,749	110.96	—
179 Highland Park, Mich.	52,950	1,165,000	2,885,000	155,000	4,205,000	53	43	4	5,225,896	3,404,100	64.82	—
180 Galveston, Tex. <sup>oo</sup>	52,938	6,251,500	—	497,500	6,749,000	377,751	—	—	3,067,250	2,155,440	41.31	100
181 Waco, Tex.	52,848	Not Reported	Not Reported	2,165,000	5,659,500	433,694	1	20	8,073,684	4,675,684	89.85	1,401,174
182 Fresno, Calif. <sup>oo</sup>	52,513	594,500	2,900,000	931,350	3,134,711	47,421	38	—	4,525,972	4,525,972	88.84	399,458
183 Hamilton, Ohio <sup>oo</sup>	52,176	1,242,861	960,000	3,398,000	8,471,462	850,028	30	70	5,936,204	5,022,461	98.67	0
184 Durham, N. C.	52,037	3,786,375	1,237,087	3,398,000	8,471,462	363,796	70	10	13,443,534	12,135,727	240.98	102,800
185 Columbia, S. C.	51,581	Not Reported	Not Reported	500,000	3,357,000	N	N	N	3,357,000	2,857,000	56.84	120,155
186 Cleveland Hts., Ohio	50,945	629,500	4,746,500	N	5,376,000	N	N	N	23,388,891	18,167,166	361.95	N
187 Port Arthur, Tex. <sup>oo</sup>	50,902	3,340,000	1,974,000	988,000	6,302,000	N	10	20	12,772,300	4,951,000	98.85	951,000
188 Dearborn, Mich.	50,358	10,998,000	5,866,275	2,218,000	19,082,275	5,638,741	83	16	N	N	N	—
189 Kenosha, Wis.	50,262	376,000	2,481,000	500,000	3,357,000	N	N	N	N	N	N	0
190 Asheville, N. C. <sup>oo</sup>	50,193	15,390,721	2,776,445	5,221,725	23,388,891	N	N	N	N	N	N	0
191 Pueblo, Colo.	50,096	3,621,000	1,330,000	7,821,300	12,772,300	N	N	N	N	N	N	—
Group V												
Population 30,000 to 50,000												
192 Pittsfield, Mass.	49,677	1,058,000	501,000	174,000	1,733,000	N	N	N	1,733,000	1,559,000	31.38	0
193 Woonsocket, R. I.	49,376	5,927,000	1,010,000	826,000	7,763,000	1,434,458	91	9	6,328,542	5,502,542	111.44	N
194 Haverhill, Mass.	48,710	1,325,000	72,000	145,000	1,542,000	N	N	N	1,542,000	1,397,000	28.68	—
195 Newcastle, Pa.	48,674	812,000	1,983,000	N	2,795,000	65,581	93	7	2,725,419	2,725,419	56.08	0
196 Everett, Mass. <sup>oo</sup>	48,424	1,232,900	548,000	107,000	1,887,900	95,377	100	N	1,792,523	1,697,147	35.05	0
197 Jackson, Miss.	48,282	4,298,180	514,000	618,390	5,430,570	179,000	100	N	5,251,570	4,633,180	95.96	260,008
198 Phoenix, Ariz. <sup>oo</sup>	48,118	3,523,000	3,655,000	4,925,000	12,103,000	1,243,122	7	93	10,859,878	5,934,878	123.34	0
199 Stockton, Calif.	47,963	4,881,700	400,000	N	5,281,700	N	N	N	5,281,700	5,281,700	110.12	18,211
200 Brookline, Mass. <sup>oo</sup>	47,490	729,500	750,000	370,000	1,849,500	N	N	N	1,849,500	1,479,500	31.15	0
201 Elmira, N. Y.	47,397	2,089,000	980,000	360,000	3,420,000	N	N	N	3,420,000	3,060,000	64.56	0

<sup>m</sup>Cedar Rapids. Debt as of March 31, 1940.

<sup>oo</sup>East Chicago. General debt includes \$142,300 bonds of park district.

<sup>oo</sup>Galveston. School debt included in general debt.

<sup>oo</sup>Fresno. Debt as of March 1, 1940.

<sup>oo</sup>Port Arthur. General debt includes sea-wall bonds retired from remission

from the state of 8/9 of the state ad valorem taxes.

<sup>oo</sup>Asheville. School debt includes \$192,445 debt of three overlapping districts not included last year. Per capita figure excluding this item is \$58.11.

<sup>oo</sup>General debt includes \$1,045,794 sanitary district bonds.

<sup>oo</sup>Everett, Phoenix, Brookline. Utility debt is not self-supporting.





	Census 1930	GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT				GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
		General Improvement	Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Im- provement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Total	Per Cent Gen'l City Obligation	Total	N
237 Oakkosh, Wis.	40,108	610,000	402,000	483,000	1,495,000	N	N	N	N	1,495,000	1,012,000	25.23	0	N	0
238 Anderson, Ind.	39,804	Not Reported													
239 East Cleveland, Ohio <sup>ss</sup>	39,667	951,000	1,503,000	N	2,454,000	809,975	48	N	N	1,644,025	1,644,025	41.44	100	171,200	100
240 La Crosse, Wis.	39,614	549,000	863,000	23,000	1,435,000	3,000	—	—	—	1,432,000	1,409,000	35.57	0	51,325	0
241 Butte, Mont.	39,532	Not Reported													
242 Sheboygan, Wis.	39,251	1,192,000	584,000	135,000	1,911,000	N	N	N	N	1,911,000	1,776,000	45.25	0	38,556	0
243 Waltham, Mass.	39,247	Not Reported													
244 Quincy, Ill. <sup>ss</sup>	39,241	N	736,000	220,000	956,000	N	N	N	N	956,000	736,000	18.76	—	150,820	—
245 Meriden, Conn.	38,481	528,000	825,000	81,000	1,434,000	10,529	100	N	N	1,423,471	1,342,471	34.89	—	—	—
246 Bloomfield, N. J.	38,077	2,215,000	2,705,500	1,094,000	6,014,500	23,000	65	N	35	5,991,500	4,905,500	128.83	—	38,331	—
247 Rock Island, Ill.	37,953	Not Reported													
248 Cumberland, Md. <sup>ss</sup>	37,747	2,644,000	1,410,000	3,174,900	7,228,900	1,212,971	36	N	64	6,015,929	3,617,914	95.85	0	N	0
249 San Bernardino, Calif.	37,481	555,417	1,203,000	194,975	1,953,392	87,410	22	67	11	1,865,982	1,680,324	44.83	0	N	0
250 Green Bay, Wis. <sup>ss</sup>	37,415	241,764	1,569,000	776,000	2,586,764	246,780	N	89	11	2,339,984	1,589,984	42.50	—	—	—
251 Raleigh, N. C.	37,379	Not Reported													
252 Taunton, Mass.	37,355	Not Reported													
253 Santa Monica, Calif. <sup>ss</sup>	37,146	1,757,500	1,769,000	5,112,953	8,639,453	242,036	34	19	47	8,397,417	3,397,066	91.45	100	186,000	100
254 West New York, N. J.	37,107	Not Reported													
255 Hazleton, Pa.	36,765	1,726,000	1,374,000	N	3,100,000	194,414	24	76	N	2,905,586	2,905,586	79.03	—	—	—
256 Danville, Ill.	36,765	117,000	272,225	N	389,225	N	N	N	N	389,225	389,225	10.59	0	91,000	0
257 High Point, N. C.	36,745	2,888,792	1,859,000	2,466,000	7,213,792	364,916	—	—	—	6,848,876	4,382,876	119.28	100	3,765,000	100
258 Auburn, N. Y.	36,652	2,645,770	1,090,000	210,500	3,946,270	21,265	N	100	N	3,925,005	3,735,770	101.93	100	128,655	100
259 Zanesville, Ohio	36,440	Not Reported													
260 Superior, Wis.	36,113	655,643	1,322,928	N	1,978,571	1,978,571	N	N	N	1,978,571	1,978,571	54.79	0	N	0
261 Arlington, Mass.	36,094	55,000	440,900	26,000	521,000	13,237	—	—	—	507,763	481,763	13.35	—	—	—
262 Norwalk, Conn. <sup>ss</sup>	36,019	2,306,000	1,978,000	850,000	5,134,000	273,890	—	N	N	4,860,110	4,010,110	111.33	0	N	0
263 Elgin, Ill. <sup>ss</sup>	35,929	1,054,500	422,000	145,000	1,621,500	26,629	31	N	69	1,594,871	1,449,871	40.35	0	237,155	0
264 Norristown, Pa.	35,853	690,000	—	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	N	0
265 White Plains, N. Y.	35,830	4,887,532	6,685,000	1,243,000	12,815,532	817,027	59	29	12	11,998,505	10,852,370	302.88	0	N	0
266 Revere, Mass.	35,680	Not Reported													
267 Steubenville, Ohio	35,422	341,990	844,750	26,000	1,212,740	45,259	40	42	18	1,167,481	1,149,581	32.45	100	620,340	100
268 Orange, N. J.	35,399	3,195,000	1,217,500	101,000	4,513,500	284,640	41	59	N	4,228,860	4,127,860	116.61	0	N	0
269 Alameda, Calif.	35,033	135,145	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100	70,498	100
270 Lewiston, Me.	34,948	Not Reported													
271 Watertown, Mass.	34,913	759,500	438,000	4,000	1,201,500	—	N	N	N	1,201,500	1,197,000	34.29	0	N	0

<sup>ss</sup>East Cleveland. General debt includes \$50,000 library debt.

<sup>ss</sup>Quincy. Utility debt includes \$200,000 sewer and sewage disposal plant not self-supporting.

<sup>ss</sup>Cumberland. School debt issued by county. Amount reported is city's share (50%).

<sup>ss</sup>Green Bay. General debt includes \$41,000 sewer district and \$16,000 park district bonds.

<sup>ss</sup>Santa Monica. Utility debt includes \$5,112,953, city's share of Metropolitan Water District debt and \$980,750 water bonds not self-supporting.

<sup>ss</sup>Norwalk. General debt includes \$19,000 public improvement district and \$75,000 for second district which is not a direct obligation of the city. See footnote 37.

<sup>ss</sup>Elgin. General debt includes sanitary district debt of \$236,000.

Census 1930	General Improvement	GROSS BONDED DEBT			Total	Gen'l Im- provement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Per Capita		ASSESSMENTS	
		General	Public	Utility					Excluding Utilities	Capital Utilities	Gen'l City	Total Obligation
272	Amsterdam, N. Y.	Not Reported	955,000	237,000	2,343,000	N	N	N	2,343,000	60.74	440,172	0
273	West Allis, Wis. <sup>89</sup>	1,151,000	34,671	237,000	5,011,100	N	N	N	4,007,100	115.96	N	0
274	New Brunswick, N. J. <sup>90</sup>	3,081,100	936,000	1,004,000	7,000,000	N	N	N	5,000,000	100.73	N	0
275	Easton, Pa.	2,865,000	1,375,000	3,569,000	4,668,170	92	8	N	4,519,383	131.29	44,317	100
276	Plainfield, N. J. <sup>91</sup>	2,986,000	1,682,000	N	4,668,000	118.617	—	—	—	—	—	—
277	Newport News, Va.	2,401,500	1,177,500	2,898,000	6,477,000	1,306,729	—	—	5,170,271	66.02	N	0
278	Santa Barbara, Calif.	1,054,825	1,361,750	3,653,500	3,050,075	254,164	29	50	2,795,911	63.95	—	—
279	Faducab, Ky.	1,611,000	150,500	2,205,000	3,966,500	203,693	34	52	3,762,807	47.30	—	—
280	Mansfield, Ohio	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
281	Joplin, Mo.	411,000	821,000	N	1,232,000	118,848	65	35	1,113,152	33.27	N	0
282	Waukegan, Ill.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
283	Norwood, Ohio	668,036	773,000	83,000	1,521,036	345,665	97	3	1,175,371	35.69	N	0
284	Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	782,500	1,909,500	150,000	2,582,000	1,335,210	10	84	1,196,790	1,121,582	33.62	N
285	Colorado Springs, Colo.	447,000	737,000	1,612,000	2,796,000	64,335	N	N	2,731,265	1,184,000	35.62	29,000
286	Elkhart, Ind.	50,000	515,900	1,096,000	1,661,900	85,405	12	N	1,576,495	355,816	16.87	—
287	Kokomo, Ind.	417,000	464,000	222,000	1,103,000	N	N	N	1,103,000	881,000	26.82	—
288	Laredo, Tex.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
289	Tucson, Ariz. <sup>92</sup>	1,301,000	1,175,000	854,500	3,340,500	639,474	48	19	2,691,026	2,047,034	62.97	78,780
290	Richmond, Ind.	590,000	570,000	N	1,160,000	68,801	55	45	1,094,199	1,094,199	33.67	—
291	Rome, N. Y.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
292	Wilmingten, N. C.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
293	Moline, Ill.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
294	Watertown, N. Y.	2,181,259	917,000	306,000	1,492,760	31,261	94	N	1,461,439	1,157,373	35.90	126,147
295	Mustogee, Okla.	Not Reported	—	—	—	220,823	64	36	3,430,386	2,877,885	89.35	7,382
296	Meridian, Miss. <sup>93</sup>	1,833,826	862,611	466,000	3,162,437	18,492	98	2	3,143,945	2,677,945	83.81	124,407
297	Pensacola, Fla.	2,211,500	782,000	171,000	3,164,500	408,397	100	N	2,755,903	2,584,903	81.86	N
298	Nashua, N. H.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
299	Fort Smith, Ark.	173,500	837,100	1,219,000	2,229,600	322,000	32	N	1,907,600	906,600	28.85	N
300	Port Huron, Mich.	934,769	364,000	4,100	1,240,769	169,205	71	29	1,071,564	1,059,564	32.83	42,295
301	Newburgh, N. Y. <sup>94</sup>	1,227,002	1,624,344	498,231	3,349,577	41,875	81	19	3,307,702	2,809,471	89.83	6,000
302	Marion, Ohio	624,500	—	N	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32,000
303	Bloomington, Ill.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	100
304	Hagerstown, Ind.	2,135,000	—	2,795,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	N
305	Bellingham, Wash. <sup>95</sup>	547,000	431,100	735,000	1,713,100	117,699	67	N	1,595,401	898,932	29.16	N
306	Baton Rouge, La.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0
307	Newark, Ohio	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
308	Everett, Wash.	785,000	296,000	1,795,000	2,876,000	222,187	29	7	2,653,813	1,000,336	32.73	—
309	Santa Ana, Calif.	411,220	1,623,000	98,970	2,133,690	144,074	22	69	1,989,616	1,901,815	62.79	445,342
310	Alton, Ill.	Not Reported	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0

<sup>89</sup>Meridian. Debt as of September 30, 1930.

<sup>90</sup>New Brunswick. Does not include bond anticipation notes of \$34,200 for municipal stadium and \$27,000 for poor relief.  
<sup>91</sup>Tucson. Water debt is legally a general city obligation, but is actually entirely self-supporting.  
<sup>92</sup>Newburgh. Welfare district bonds of \$80,000 included in general debt are a joint liability of the city and town of Newburgh.  
<sup>93</sup>Bellingham. Utility debt includes city's share \$129,000 of Port of Bellingham debt.

			GROSS BONDED DEBT				SINKING FUNDS				NET BONDED DEBT			GROSS SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS	
Population			General Improvement		Public Schools	Public Utility	Total	Gen'l Im- provement (per cent)	Public School (per cent)	Public Utility (per cent)	Total	Excluding Utilities	Per Capita Excluding Utilities	Per Cent Gen'l City	Total Obligation
Canadian Cities															
1	Montreal, Que. <sup>ss</sup>	818,577	166,596,611	35,697,000	33,691,000	68,061,591	270,355,202	85	13	2	216,714,941	149,704,077	182.88	—	39,129,036
2	Toronto, Ont. <sup>ss</sup>	626,674	50,681,603	23,951,361	68,736,097	143,369,061	32,640,261	32	22	46	110,778,308	57,072,906	91.07	—	14,348,918
3	Vancouver, B. C.	246,593	44,116,548	10,306,283	9,640,252	64,063,083	14,395,304	—	—	—	110,778,308	43,787,848	177.57	—	6,599,788
4	Winnipeg, Man.	218,785	11,846,968	8,497,529	39,967,344	60,311,841	33,384,613	20	14	66	26,927,228	8,741,439	39.95	—	3,823,305
5	Hamilton, Ont.	153,507	14,155,209	3,155,358	5,559,200	22,869,767	534,705	3	N	97	22,335,162	17,294,566	112.66	—	1,165,622
6	Quebec, Que.	130,594	Not Reported												
7	Ottawa, Ont.	126,872	10,555,075	3,196,324	5,871,698	19,623,098	4,756,389	32	13	55	14,866,709	11,620,094	91.59	—	2,116,445
8	Windsor, Ont. <sup>ss</sup>	103,644	28,415,152	4,180,562	50,000	32,645,714	1,040,496	—	—	—	31,605,218	—	—	—	—
9	Edmonton, Alta. <sup>ss</sup>	90,419	20,240,219	3,190,351	5,500,017	28,930,587	5,325,656	93	7	N	23,604,931	18,104,914	200.23	—	—
10	Calgary, Alta.	83,761	2,171,947	1,865,700	10,186,997	14,224,644	1,265,440	—	—	21	12,959,204	2,798,622	33.41	—	1,989,697
11	London, Ont. <sup>ss</sup>	71,148	3,933,253	1,842,794	2,860,827	8,636,874	2,745,884	35	23	42	5,890,990	4,182,144	58.78	—	354,104
12	Verdun, Que. <sup>ss</sup>	60,745	8,590,491	3,857,139	100,000	12,457,630	2,659,228	89	10	1	9,798,402	9,733,727	160.24	—	1,732,500
13	Halifax, N. S. <sup>ss</sup>	59,275	10,990,730	2,743,804	2,233,769	15,968,303	5,874,426	60	28	12	10,093,877	8,583,560	144.81	—	1,986,376
14	Regina, Sask. <sup>ss</sup>	53,209	7,027,877	2,350,746	6,124,185	15,502,808	7,212,329	42	10	48	8,290,479	5,646,867	106.13	—	3,111,028
15	St. John, N. B. <sup>ss</sup>	47,514	2,700,145	2,261,500	3,726,662	8,688,307	3,263,324	38	23	39	5,424,983	2,981,633	62.75	—	146,196
16	Saskatoon, Sask.	43,291	6,524,777	2,623,073	4,096,317	13,244,167	5,920,000	41	11	48	7,324,167	6,058,629	139.95	—	2,349,911
17	Victoria, B. C.	39,082	8,949,094	110,000	4,730,380	13,789,474	304,846	23	31	46	13,484,628	8,894,835	227.59	N	0
18	Three Rivers, Que.	35,450	Not Reported												

<sup>ss</sup>Montreal. Debt as of October 31, 1939.  
<sup>ss</sup>Toronto. School debt includes \$2,000,000 issued by Toronto R. C. School Board, a separate corporation.  
<sup>ss</sup>Windsor. Figures shown are total debt for all purposes including special assessments. Segregation of utility from general debt not available.  
<sup>ss</sup>Edmonton. Property owners share of special assessments is \$1,332,295, city's share included in general debt, but amount not available.  
<sup>ss</sup>London. Electric Radial debt of \$1,633,439 is not self-supporting.

<sup>ss</sup>Verdun. General debt includes \$12,246 consolidated property-tax bonds redeemable from collections.  
<sup>ss</sup>Halifax. Debt as of April 30, 1939.

<sup>ss</sup>Regina. General debt includes \$100,000 airport. Street railway debt of \$1,969,318 is not self-supporting.  
<sup>ss</sup>St. John. Does not include city's liability for county debt of \$2,244,503 incurred for hospitals and relief.



# Contributors in Review

---

**S**INCE 1935 **Richard A. Atkins** (*The Old and the New in Massachusetts Towns*) has served on the staff of the Boston Municipal Research Bureau, more recently as assistant secretary. He followed his graduation from Hamilton College with a term as school master, then went back to school himself to do advanced work at Harvard and at the Syracuse School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.

---

**A** NEWSPAPERMAN who is not cynical about good government, **Lewis W. Bailey** (*Dallas Weighs City-County Merger*) was a member of the Charter Commission which gave council-manager government to Dallas, Texas, and is now a member of the Citizens Traffic Commission, appointed by the city manager. Besides being editor of the *Dallas Journal*, Mr. Bailey is its chief editorial writer. He began his newspaper career in 1898 in Michigan, and went to Dallas twenty years ago.

---

**T**O observe government in operation is a major professional duty of **Edward F. Dow** (*Maine's Political Chickens*). In 1936-37, on leave from the University of Maine where he heads the Department of History and Government, Professor Dow served as special agent for the Department of Commerce, carrying on research in three cities. In 1938 he collaborated in a study of city manager government in Portland for the Social Science Research Council. In 1940 he will serve on the Maine staff of the Brookings institution in making a survey of local relief administration.

---

**H**AVING rounded out twenty-five years as director of the Citizens League of Cleveland, **Mayo Fesler** (*Denver Consolidation a Shining Light*) can look back also upon sixteen additional years with citizen organizations in other cities, including the Civic League of St. Louis, the City Club of Chicago, and the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. A few years ago Mr. Fesler made a swing around the country to find out about city-county consolidation in other jurisdictions besides Cleveland; he collected a mass of material which is still in process of being written down.

---

**I**N THE line of duty **Frederick P. Gruenberg** (*Philadelphia's City-County Dilemma*) has been, at various times, a business man, a teacher, a social worker, a financier, a researcher, and a citizen campaign leader. With a background of diverse business and financial experience, he was the director of the Philadelphia Bureau of Municipal Research, lectured at Hobart College and the Pennsylvania School of Social and Health Work, served as public service commissioner of Pennsylvania from 1931 to 1937, and has been executive secretary of the City Charter Committee of Philadelphia since 1938.

---

**E**XCEPT for an interlude in 1933-36, **Robert A. Martino** (*County Purchasing Methods Reviewed*) has been on the staff of the National Bureau of Standards United States Department of Commerce, since 1923. Now he is chief of the consumer contacts and labeling section. Mr. Martino's work deals with governmental purchasing and consumer activities, commercial standardization, the preparation of publications dealing with standards and specifications and labeling operations. The three-year interlude was as liaison officer of the NRA as consumer representative on codes and later as assistant deputy administrator.

(Continued on Page 432)

# The Researcher's Digest: June

---

*Research made elementary by Dayton bureau; Washington bibliography of state publications; responsibility of citizens for increasing government costs; distribution of research bulletins; Rochester birthday.*

---

THE popular conception of the expert as one who knows more and more about less and less is often bulwarked by the expert's irritating habit of using big words, high-sounding words, and words with technical meanings. Therefore it happens that the expert frequently finds himself handing out his knowledge to an exclusive audience composed of other experts who neither appreciate his wisdom nor profit by his warnings. And the general public remains in the dark.

To bring light painlessly, nonirritatingly, to the governmentally "unwashed" is the increasingly frequent aim of the research bureaus. Now comes the **Dayton Research Association** with an appealing *Adult Primer of Montgomery County Government* (March 1940).

In twenty-one mimeographed pages, using capital letters exclusively, with a plentiful leavening of simplified maps, pictorial diagrams, and drawings, the association delves into the historical past, tells how the county grew, explains governmental structure and governmental cost, outlines the duties of each of the county departments, and winds up with ten precepts under the heading "So, What About It?"

According to the research bureau, the answer to that question is that improvement in government is gradual, and must result from knowledge of the facts and the realities. Point number 7 is: "A Study of Government Should Begin with an Elementary Outline (A Primer), Disregarding the Extent of Education of 'The Pupil' Along Other Lines." The Dayton Research Associations' *Adult Primer* admirably fills the bill.

## Seeing Eye

Streams of publications issue from government offices and John Q. Citizen, as usual in the dark, doesn't realize that the specific information he wants on the care and feeding of moths, the location of vacation camp sites, and the whys and wherefores of the tax collector's office, is available to him at the price of a two-cent stamp and an envelope addressed to "the government."

The **Bureau of Governmental Research of the University of Washington** has therefore constituted itself a seeing eye for blind Mr. Citizen in the state of Washington. Report No. 41 (March 1, 1940) is a list of periodical and other current publications issued by offices, departments, and institutions of the state of Washington.

The foreword to *Publications of the State of Washington* supplies the incidental information that the state publishes "over two hundred biennial, annual, semi-annual, and other periodical publications and has in print approximately 1,250 other individual publications of current and general interest which with few exceptions are available to the public."

---

## Milwaukeeans Want Too Much

An unusual tack on the question of rising government costs is taken by the **Citizens' Bureau of Milwaukee** in its bulletin of May 4. Instead of reviling government officials for their spending ways, the Bureau admonishes: "Milwaukeeans should STOP DEMANDING INCREASED EXPENDITURES!"

The bureau studied the *Financial Statistics of Cities* of the United States

Bureau of the Census and found that Milwaukee's per capita operation and maintenance expenditures for general departments was 15 per cent more in 1937 than in 1926, comparing with a 7 per cent increase in the costs of the twenty-five largest cities in the United States. Pensions to public employees, health and hospitals, police, recreation and sanitation, were among the items whose cost increased in greater proportion than similar costs in other cities.

### **Transmission Belt for Research**

A new arrangement which it deems to have vast potentialities for increasing the circulation of research bureau publications has been developed by the **Citizens' Bureau of Governmental Research of New York State**. The bureau offers to taxpayer and civic groups in the state, at minimum prices, copies of its bulletins in bulk, for distribution to members of the interested groups through their own channels. There are two price schedules: one for copies of the bulletin on the bureau's own masthead; another for copies on the masthead of the distributing organization, with a special message from the organization to its own members printed above the body of the bulletin.

Says the bureau: "The advantages of this arrangement are: a saving to the bureau of more than \$9,000 a year in printing and mailing costs; the securing of select mailing lists; the actual or implied endorsement of the distributing organizations; and the awakening of interest in government of many people who would not otherwise receive data on administrative improvements and economy in public affairs."

### **GRA Constitution Fails**

A proposed new constitution for the Governmental Research Association was turned down by fifty-four votes to sixty-nine in a mail balloting, reports the GRA's April *Bulletin*. Tabulated as part

of the negative vote were fifty-nine non-voters. The organization is now considering amendment of its old constitution. Fundamental question before the membership is the delimitation of membership.

### **Silver Anniversary**

The **Rochester Bureau of Municipal Research** was twenty-five years old on Saturday, April 20.

## **Research Bureau Reports Received**

### **Bibliography**

**Publications of the State of Washington.** Compiled by Lloyd W. Schram. Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Washington, Seattle, March 1, 1940. 35 pp. mimeo.

### **County Government**

**An Adult Primer of Montgomery County Government.** Dayton, Ohio, Research Association, March 1940. 21 pp. mimeo.

### **Finance**

**Pertinent Financial Data, City of Baltimore.** As at January 1, 1940. Baltimore, Md. Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, Inc., 1940. 15 pp.

### **Personnel**

Progress with a No-Hiring Policy. Boston Municipal Research Bureau, *Bulletin*, May 6, 1940. 8 pp.

### **Proportional Representation**

**Baltimore Elections and Proportional Representation.** A report by the staff of the Baltimore Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, Inc., April 1940. 28 pp. mimeo. (For a review of this publication see page 431 of this issue.)



# News in Review

## City, County, State Progress in Brief

(Continued from Page 355)

ing and within the protection afforded by the courts."

### ***Initiative Proposals in Washington***

State-wide attention is being directed toward Initiative No. 145, providing a complete reorganization of the state of Washington's administrative code, reducing the number of policy-determining departments under control of the governor from thirteen to eight, providing budgetary control by a board of finance consisting of the governor, state auditor, and treasurer, and also providing increased responsibilities for other elective department heads.

Other initiatives for which public support is sought would provide a unicameral legislature, increased old-age pensions (from \$30 to \$40 monthly), and state regulation of the gasoline industry, and would require public utility districts to submit proposed bond issues to a vote of the citizens in each district, a majority of 50 per cent of the number voting in the last previous general election being needed to authorize.

EWEN C. DINGWALL

Municipal League of Seattle

### ***Personnel Aid for Cities***

New York municipalities will soon be able to obtain advice and technical assistance on personnel management from the state under a new amendment to the state civil service law which authorizes the State Civil Service Commission to furnish cities and other local governments, at their request, with technical personnel services on job classifications and civil service examinations for such compensation as may be agreed upon.

The California State Personnel Board in Sacramento is now preparing examina-

tion material, giving examinations, and performing other personnel functions, in varying degree, for Los Angeles County and for seven of the smaller municipalities of the state.

Minnesota, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, have also provided that the state may furnish personnel facilities to local governments at their expense, according to the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada.

### ***Americans Moving to Suburbs***

Because of many different factors, cities of the United States are "flattening out," according to Director William L. Austin of the United States Bureau of the Census. The census chief made this statement recently after studying field office reports for the 1940 census—the nation's sixteenth decennial enumeration—which indicate that a tremendous migration of city residents to suburban areas has taken place since the 1930 census.

Among the factors recited by Director Austin in this significant population movement are: improved roads and transportation facilities which enable people to live farther away from their work; cheaper housing in rural areas near cities; opportunities to supplement wage and salary income by raising poultry and garden produce; and expansion of electric and water service to rural areas in recent years. Probably the greatest factor, however, was the desire to own a home and a plot of ground out in the country.

There is little doubt that this flattening out process will be reflected in 1940 population figures of many cities, Director Austin said. The rate of growth in hundreds of cities has slowed down. Some cities will show an actual decline in population. This development was forecast by the test census last summer in two

Indiana counties. A slight decrease in the population of South Bend and Mishawaka, the leading cities in the two counties, was more than balanced by a sharp increase in the number of residents living in adjacent areas.

These population losses did not affect the economic strength of the cities, the census head explained, since the suburban residents still worked and spent their money in the urban areas. In fact, a whole new market was created for such commodities as gardening tools, sports equipment, and lawn and porch furniture.

Additional indications of this movement were found in the returns of the 1935 farm census which revealed a sharp increase in the number of small farms located in the neighborhood of industrial areas, and in the number of part-time farmers.

---

### **Council-Manager Plan News**

The council-manager plan was adopted by **Silverton, Oregon**, by a vote of 551 to 368 on May 17. Five other local governments in that state are reported to be studying the plan, namely, **Klamath Falls, Roseburg, Salem, Grants Pass, Clatsop County, and Clackamas County**.

In **Arcadia, California**, the manager plan was defeated by a vote of 1,923 to 635.

A petition seeking to place Plan E—the council-manager plan with P.R.—on the ballot in **Cambridge, Massachusetts**, for the second time next fall, was filed May 7 by Dean James M. Landis of the Harvard Law School, leader in the movement. It was reported to contain more than 9,000 names, whereas only 4,600 are necessary, this being 10 per cent of the vote cast in the last gubernatorial election.

**Lowell and North Adams, Massachusetts**, have joined the list of cities in that state which are working toward a charter change to provide for council-manager government.

**Newport, Rhode Island**, which in 1926 voted almost three to one in favor of the city manager plan (an advisory vote only), has again become actively interested in the subject. The committee on municipal affairs of the Chamber of Commerce has recently sent out questionnaires to Newport citizens asking if they favor a change in the present form of government and if so, whether they favor the manager plan. The committee has already expressed itself unanimously as favorable to the latter.

In **Fayetteville, North Carolina**, a committee representing a number of civic organizations has been discussing a proposed change to the manager plan. I. M. Richardson, secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, recommended the plan to the Kiwanis Club in May, on the basis of his experience in Sumter, South Carolina, where the plan is in effect.

In **East Lansing, Michigan**, at a meeting of the Commercial Club on May 7, the city manager form of government, as compared with East Lansing's aldermanic type, was praised by William J. Balgooyen, city attorney of Muskegon Heights. The club has petitioned the city council to submit to the voters the question of revising the city charter and one of the changes that many supporters of the proposal favor is the establishment of the manager form of government in East Lansing.

In **Illinois** both the Democratic candidate for governor, Harry B. Hershey, and the Republican candidate, Dwight H. Green, have signed the petition calling for a referendum as to whether the legislature shall make it possible for any city to adopt the council-manager plan if it so desires, according to Mrs. Philip Ringer, city manager petition chairman of the Illinois League of Women Voters.

The village of **St. Louis Park, Minnesota**, may have opportunity to vote on the manager plan. A charter drafted by a citizen committee calls for a man-

ager of village affairs to be employed directly by the village council and responsible to it, according to Marlowe Stevens, chairman of the charter committee. It is expected that the council will submit it to the voters of the village for a referendum.

The new council of **Kansas City, Missouri**, has appointed as city manager L. P. Cookingham, manager at Saginaw, Michigan, since 1936, and president of the International City Managers' Association. He is expected to take office early in June. In May the council voted to hire four experts to gather technical and personnel information to be available for Mr. Cookingham.

The city of **San Benito, Texas**, although not provided with a manager charter, has a city manager through appointment by the city commission on April 22. He was instructed by the commission to make a survey of all city departments immediately and to prepare a report, with recommendations, on conditions, costs, etc.

**Lynn, Massachusetts; Waterbury, Vermont; Thompsonville, Connecticut; Dunkirk, New York, and Vernon, Texas**, are among American communities that are showing interest in the plan.

#### *City Manager Meetings*

City and town managers in **Vermont** met at Rutland on April 18, elected officers, and discussed management problems. The next meeting is planned for early July in Montpelier.

**Southeastern Michigan** managers held a dinner meeting at Pontiac on April 19, with the city manager as host. The main topic of the evening, aside from professional matters, was a discussion of the factors that should determine an essential municipal service.

The **Florida** managers met at Orlando on April 21, with fourteen managers in attendance. New officers were elected and a committee was appointed to draft

a constitution to be submitted at the next regular meeting, to be held in December.

#### *San Jose Charter Amendments*

Four out of five charter amendments that were voted on in San Jose, California, on May 6 were adopted. The successful measures provide that:

1. Council members shall be elected for four-year terms instead of six. Elections will continue to be two years apart, with four councilmen chosen at one election and three at the next, instead of 2-2-3 as at present.

2. The question of retaining or discharging the incumbent city manager shall be placed on the ballot every two years.

3. The civil service commissioners shall be appointed for life by the council, but are subject to removal by the council and also, every four years, by the voters. They may also be paid, whereas now they are unpaid.

5. Members of the Board of Education are to be elected at a municipal election, instead of being appointed by the manager. No method of nomination and election is specified. Protection of non-teaching employees against dismissal is weakened.

The one amendment that was defeated was No. 4, which stated that the civil service commission "shall provide for the promotion to all positions in the classified service based on competitive written examinations with due consideration to the records of efficiency, character, and seniority." It did not apply to initial employment.

All five amendments were opposed by the Citizens' Charter Association. They must still be passed upon by the state legislature, where one of the obstacles will be certain defects in wording.

#### *Los Angeles Charter Consultants Board*

Mayor Fletcher Bowron of Los



Angeles has recently appointed a board of consultants to assist the citizens' committee already named by him,<sup>1</sup> in the proposed revision of the city's charter. The consultants are Edwin A. Cottrell of Stanford University, L. Tilton Deming on the staffs of the State Planning and Natural Resources Boards, William B. Munro of California Institute of Technology, and John M. Pfiffner of the University of Southern California.

EDWIN A. COTTRELL

Stanford University

### ***New Municipal Training Bulletin in New York State***

Four agencies—the New York State Department of Civil Service, the New York State Conference of Mayors, the Municipal Training Institute of New York, and the Bureau of Public Service Training of the State Department of Education—are coöperating in the preparation and circulation of a new bulletin called *Municipal Civil Service Information and Training Extension Service*, the primary aim of which is to contribute to higher standards and other permanent improvements in local administration.

### ***In-Service Training for Municipal Employees***

The total number of firemen, policemen, finance officers, and other municipal employees taking in-service training in order to learn more about their work is now approximately 50,000 according to a report of the International City Managers' Association.

All but ten states had some sort of public service training program last year for local government employees, and grants from federal funds for this purpose amounted to \$90,000. Most of the courses were for firemen and policemen. About 30,000 firemen went to school in

thirty states, and 9,000 policemen attended courses in twenty states.

Fifteen states extended training programs to other jobs, each conducting one or more courses for officials such as assessors, city attorneys, city clerks, finance officers, food inspectors, justices of the peace, park employees, and swimming pool operators.

Public employees are being taught at zone schools, central schools, and by itinerant instructors—all programs designed to meet the training needs of small cities at minimum cost.

Long-term programs for public service training were started or continued in twelve states in 1939, and by the end of the year full-time supervisors of training were at work for state boards in Arkansas, California, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania. Many state leagues of municipalities, which originated training programs for public employees before the George-Deen act was passed, advise the state vocational boards.

Municipal administrators also sought training on the job. Approximately 150 public officials last year enrolled in courses offered by the Institute for Training in Municipal Administration conducted by the International City Managers' Association. City administrators in Oklahoma and key administrators of the Los Angeles city government were given training under an experimental program originated by their respective vocational boards. Massachusetts initiated a training course by conference method for fire department command officers.

A number of universities were active in in-service training in 1939, offering night courses or periodic institutes. The University of Southern California held a one-week institute of government which enrolled more than 3,200 public employees from 138 cities, a dozen states, and other governmental jurisdictions.

<sup>1</sup>See NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW for May 1940, p. 329.

### ***Training Finance Officers***

The finance officers' training program in Michigan, sponsored by the State Board for Vocational Education, the Michigan Municipal League, the University of Michigan, and the Municipal Finance Officers' Association of the United States and Canada, is getting under way on a broad basis with the completion of instructional material on accounting for receipts, expenditures, assets and liabilities, and preparation of the budget and reports.

In Texas and Alabama, according to the American Municipal Association, state boards for vocational education, in cooperation with the state leagues of municipalities, are also planning programs of training for finance officers.

---

### ***West Virginia League Establishes Publication***

Volume 1, No. 1, of *The West Virginia City*, official organ of the West Virginia League of Municipalities, appeared under date of May 1, 1940. The purpose as announced by Walter F. Ball of New Martinsville, president of the league is "to bind ourselves more firmly together as a fighting unit, and to bring the activities of the league closer to the mayors, councilmen, and other city officials of West Virginia." The managing editor is Orren L. Jones, at Middlebourne, and the league editor is Hume K. Nowlan, of Hinton.

---

### ***Pan-American Intercity Cooperation Makes Headway***

The movement toward coöperation among the municipalities of the twenty-one American republics has produced definite results in the creation of a national union of cities in Costa Rica and the appointment of organizing committees for such unions in five other countries. Such coöperation among city governments of different countries should be an im-

portant aid in the effort to foster international good will.

The American Municipal Association reports that since the Pan-American Commission on Intermunicipal Coöperation held its first meeting in Chicago last November, its president, Dr. Antonio Beruff Mendieta, of Havana, Cuba, has appointed organizing or liaison committees for Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Haiti. The Costa Rican national municipal union held its first Congress of Municipalities in San Jose in March.

National unions of municipalities had already been set up in Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

The first national union or league of city governments was founded in Norway in 1838. Since that time municipalities in the leading countries of the world have organized leagues or associations to help solve their common problems.

The Pan-American Commission on Intermunicipal Coöperation was established by act of the first Pan-American Congress of Municipalities, which met in Havana in November 1938. The Congress was founded with the approval of the Pan-American Union.

---

### ***Colorado Conference***

A Citizens' Conference on Government Management, sponsored by the Department of Government Management of the University of Denver School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, under a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, will be held at Estes Park, Colorado, June 17-22. Subjects to be discussed are: measuring the quality of our government, conserving the credit of our local governments, balancing the state and local tax structures, the function of citizens' groups in self-government, national and state pressure on local government, personnel standards in civil service, the administration of public relief, and how shall business be taxed.

## Montclair Citizens Elect Full Slate

---

### *Women voters meet; Citizenship Day spreads*

---

*Edited by*

**ELWOOD N. THOMPSON**

---

The Montclair Association of Montclair, New Jersey, was organized in 1934 for the purposes expressed in its charter:

"1. To further the cause of good government in the town of Montclair;

"2. To arouse and maintain the interest of its citizens in the public affairs of the town."

The association believes in carrying this program straight to the ballot box.

At elections for the Board of Commissioners it gives its active support to the election of five of the best qualified candidates and has enlisted the services of over three hundred volunteer workers for house-to-house canvasses, the maintenance of headquarters, and other election activities. At the recent May 14 election it succeeded in electing its entire slate of citizen-supported candidates against machine opposition, thus insuring Montclair another four years of efficient government.

Between elections the association encourages the attendance of its members at commission meetings; holds periodical meetings of its executive committee of fifty members; publishes each year five or six issues of *Montclair Matters*, to give unbiased information on various town problems and the administration of the town government. This publication is mailed to about 5,000 households, the expense being borne by membership dues and voluntary contributions.

Four of the five members of the Town Commission, who were elected in 1936

with the support of the association, have been faithful to the principles of the association and have been unusually alert to encourage citizen participation in the government. The commission, acting through its majority members, has appointed, in all, twenty-six advisory committees enlisting the services of over three hundred citizens, including an advisory committee of real estate men in connection with a re-assessment program, a committee of insurance men to revise the town's insurance program, a committee of engineers to study the water and lighting system, citizens' advisory committees for the Town Planning Board and the Relief Administration. In the last two years it has created a Citizens' Budget Committee composed of representatives of thirty civic organizations which has made recommendations to the commission with respect to the proposed budget after weeks of intensive study. It has also taken several post-card ballots to obtain the views of the taxpayers on town problems.

In this manner the Montclair Association is endeavoring to demonstrate in its community that democracy can and does work.

ERNEST G. FIFIELD, *Secretary*  
Montclair Association

---

### *League of Women Voters Adopts National Program*

Science made one of its important contributions when it unleashed women from household drudgery and gave them time for political life, President Karl T. Compton of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology explained recently to an audience of women in New York City.

The meeting at which Dr. Compton spoke gave evidence to support the speaker's conclusions. It was the twentieth anniversary convention of the National League of Women Voters (April 29-May 3, 1940).



A speaker at the same meeting (there were few "set speakers" at the rest of the meetings) harked back to the days when an all-woman prayer meeting was frowned on by a certain gentleman who was reputed to have said, "Who can tell what those misguided females will pray for?"

The females at these League of Women Voters' meetings were praying for a catholic number of things. For five full days the delegates of local and state Leagues of Women Voters all over the nation gave concentrated attention to a program whose scope was the approximate equivalent of the entire range of the American governmental scene.

The program adopted under the league's Department of Government and Its Operation (league work is divided into five departments) will give some indication of the league's prayers with regard to local government and governmental structure. The ladies voted to advocate:

1. Qualified personnel in government service;
2. Executive responsibility for the preparation of budgets and for effective control of their operation;
3. Development of a coördinated tax system through scientific research procedure with increasing regard to the principle of ability to pay;
4. Administrative organization to promote efficiency and responsibility;
5. Suffrage for the District of Columbia;
6. The manager plan for local governments, preferably with legislative body elected by proportional representation;
7. Strengthening of representative government through permanent registration, the short ballot, and direct nomination of candidates for office;
8. Organization of state legislatures to promote efficiency and responsibility;
9. Opposition to discrimination in public employment based on sex or marital status;

10. Improved juries and jury administration;

11. Opposition to the proposed equal rights amendment.

The debate on item number 3 may serve to illustrate the searching quality of the discussions. As originally presented by the program committee, this item lacked the final clause, "with increasing regard to the principle of ability to pay." In the course of the consideration of the item, not only was the amendment hammered in, but there was an earnest debate on such matters as sales taxes and hidden vs. non-hidden taxes.

In previous years item number 6 had read: "The municipal manager plan, preferably with council elected by proportional representation." The change was made, the chairman explained, because many members of the league were working for adoption of the county manager plan in their areas.

It was notable in all the meetings devoted to discussion of the proposed program that attention was strictly to business. One morning the delegates convened at 8:30 A.M. and the chairman remarked that it was the fullest session of the entire convention. Discussion was at all times very much to the point. No one wasted time arguing about points on which there was obviously agreement. Convention addicts will realize that such a sensible rule does not *always* prevail at men's meetings.

Significantly, there was no discussion of items 1, 2, and 6, which were passed unanimously.

Perhaps the best commentary on the League of Women Voters is a remark attributed to Miss Marguerite M. Wells, the organization's president (who is, incidentally, a vice president of the National Municipal League). Said Miss Wells, in a relaxed moment, "You know, there's only one thing I want—and that's to improve the electorate!"

MIRIAM ROHER

### ***Citizenship in Four Patterns***

Citizenship Day, inaugurated last year in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin, as a program of study classes and formal initiation for new voters, has spread throughout the country in at least four distinct patterns in 1940, a National Municipal League survey indicates. Newspaper clippings and correspondence show that "Citizenship Day" has emerged in various localities as:

1. A program of study classes for twenty-one-year-olds culminating in induction ceremonies, following the Manitowoc precedent;

2. A day of formal exercises for new voters and newly naturalized citizens, without benefit of study classes;

3. A day on which high school students "take over" city hall;

4. A day formally known as "Citizenship Day" without any special observance.

The day itself has been called by at least three names—Citizenship Day, New Citizens' Day, and I Am an American Day. The latter designation was given impetus by the formal declaration of Congress and the President, when they set aside May 19 as I am an American Day. Exercises this year were held on various dates in May.

Nineteen of Wisconsin's thirty-five counties, as well as a good many other localities, carried out the full program of open forums and discussion groups, classes in citizenship meeting several times over a period of some weeks or months, and, in some cases, a day of "open house" in the city offices preceding the induction ceremonies. This group included Alexandria and Indianapolis, Indiana; Lyon County, Kansas; Birmingham, Dearborn, Holly, Muskegon, and Oakland County, Michigan; and Brooklyn, New York.

Some of the activities which were added in a few communities included the showing of free movies of the 1939 Manitowoc exercises, and various social events

for the young people designed to acquaint the future citizens of the community with their neighbors and fellow-workers.

The Citizenship Day celebration itself was variously marked with such activities as flag-raising, the pledge of allegiance, patriotic songs, parade of floats depicting different aspects of community life, and a formal address of welcome given by the mayor or some outstanding member of the community.

Conventions of "21-ers" met in a number of Wisconsin counties. Celebration of Citizenship Day by the awarding of certificates of citizenship "with appropriate ceremonies" is mandatory in Wisconsin by a law passed by the state legislature in 1939. The conventions set up permanent organizations to help plan the educational program for the following year and to take charge of the ceremonies.

Among the communities which held formal exercises for the awarding of certificates of citizenship to their twenty-one-year-olds and naturalized citizens voting for the first time this year were: Bisbee, Miami, and Tucson, Arizona; Chula Vista, Coronado, Long Beach, Pasadena, San Diego, San Francisco and Vallejo, California; Sterling, Colorado; Greenville, Hazel Park, Lansing, Pontiac, Royal Oak, and St. Johns, Michigan; Jefferson City, Missouri; Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, and Sandusky, Ohio; Tulsa, Oklahoma; Barnwell County, South Carolina; Amarillo and Lamesa, Texas; Seattle and Tacoma, Washington; and Belmont County, West Virginia.

A few cities marked the day with broadcasts addressed to the young people, or by simply setting aside an hour in their honor. While such activities did not incorporate formal exercises this year, it is possible that in future years they will develop into a well rounded program of citizenship training culminating in induction ceremonies.

Citizenship Day as a part of National Boys and Girls Week was celebrated in

many California communities, as well as in Atlanta, Georgia; Beaumont, Texas; and in some other cities and towns. Offices of the town or city were turned over to high school students for an hour or so during the day. While this idea has its own merit, as has California's Citizenship Week celebration, neither is part of the program set out for national application in the Manitowoc Plan.

ELIZABETH R. BROWN

### ***Seattle Membership Quadruples in Two Years***

The Seattle Municipal League concluded its spring and winter educational program with an annual membership dinner on May 21. During the year the league sponsored nine local government forums on county government, three on the city, two on school administration, and one on the Port of Seattle. In addition the league interviewed approximately sixty-five speakers over twenty-one quarter-hour radio programs, on matters of civic interest. Wide public interest in the problems of local government was created as a result of the forums, as well as a large group of competent, well qualified speakers to carry on next year's programs. Shortly after the re-election of Mayor Arthur B. Langlie by a large majority, the mayor and city council spoke at a league dinner, promising continued coöperation to bring about immediate revisions in the city's accounting system and more effective city planning. Plans for the coming winter include new series of forums, probably to be held before local city and county community groups.

Membership in the Seattle Municipal League has quadrupled during the past two years under the leadership of President George LaFray who retires this month, J. W. Clise, treasurer, and Glen B. Eastburn, executive secretary.

EWEN C. DINGWELL  
Municipal League of Seattle

## **County Legislation Lags in New York**

***States ease county public  
assistance burdens; New  
York City tries for county  
reform; health awards***

*Edited by*

ELWYN A. MAUCK

Recent events in the New York legislature indicate that the problems involved in the modernization of local government are destined to harass the people of that state for many years to come. Although the opponents of reform apparently won temporary victories in the constitutional convention of 1938, it is reasonable to assume that they will be unable to oppose successfully the inexorable requirements of a modern society. In this era of mobility and change the problem of allocating functions to those units most capable of performing them is one which is pressing most persistently for a solution. Its implications are much more fundamental, for example, than those embraced in plans of improving the administrative structure and procedure in any level of government. Probably soon the constitutional provisions virtually prohibiting the reallocation of functions will be subject to reconsideration and modification.

The constitution of New York prior to 1939, in its county home rule provisions, permitted considerable latitude in the transfer of local functions. The major obstacle to the adoption of a county charter lay in the provision that where the county included a city containing one-fourth or more of the population of the county, the proposal had to secure an affirmative vote (1) in any such city and (2) in the county outside any such city.

The restrictions in the new constitution do not include the provision above, but they embrace all counties attempting any



transfer of functions. The provision states:

If any such form of government provides for the transfer of any function of local government to or from the cities, the towns or the villages of the county, or any class thereof, it shall not take effect with respect to such transfer unless the transfer, or the form of government containing it, shall also receive a majority of all the votes cast thereon in such cities, towns, villages, or class thereof, as the case may be.

Thus not only major cities, but the towns (townships) or small villages can prevent the adoption of a county charter that might impinge on their prized prerogatives. The doctrine of home rule appears to suffer most from those who claim to be its friends.

Present legislative efforts are being directed to bringing the three optional county government laws into conformity with the 1938 constitution. The laws are popularly known as the Fearon optional county government law of 1936 and the Buckley and Desmond optional county government acts of 1937. Two of the three laws still contain clauses which state that proposed charters must secure an affirmative vote by a split referendum as required by the old constitution.

The legislature has attempted no real solution to the problem of restoring a substantive county home rule plan capable of operation. Although the 1940 legislature adopted a constitutional amendment restoring the old split referendum, such referendum now would become merely an additional restriction. The proposal must be passed by a succeeding legislature and by a popular referendum before it becomes part of the new constitution.

Bills amending the Buckley and Desmond acts to make them conform to the new constitution were introduced in the 1939 legislature, but were not enacted into law. Bills to amend the Desmond and Fearon acts in the same manner were

brought before the 1940 legislature, but only the one amending the Fearon act succeeded in passing. The bill to amend the Desmond act passed the Assembly only in 1939 and the Senate only in 1940.

Miscellaneous local government acts of the 1940 legislature include a law authorizing counties to create and maintain soil conservation districts. A proposal requiring publicity for county budgets failed to pass.

---

### ***Public Assistance Burdens Shifted from Counties***

Experience under the public assistance provisions (grants-in-aid for the aged, dependent children, and for the blind) of the social security act has demonstrated that counties were given burdens beyond their ability to bear. The fact that the amount of assistance and the type of service varied greatly in different counties within a state, in spite of the purpose of the social security act to provide the same quality of care to individuals in similar circumstances, illustrates the sheer inability of many counties to meet their obligations. States, in recognition of this problem, are groping for solutions. In the past year thirteen states have decreased the proportion of public assistance costs to be borne by local units. Furthermore, there is a tendency to shift part of the local administrative costs to the states.

The costs of all three types of public assistance have been shifted completely from local units to the state governments in Idaho, Louisiana, and Washington. Decreases in the proportion of old-age assistance contributions borne by local units have been instituted in Indiana, Oregon, and North Dakota. The local share for aid to dependent children has been decreased in Vermont. In Maryland the law relating to aid for the blind has been changed reducing the burden on counties. Henceforth, of the 50 per cent to be borne by the state and local

units, the state will bear 15 per cent and the county 35 per cent.

In Colorado the county share of administrative costs has been reduced in all three programs, while in Wisconsin the administrative cost of the dependent children's aid program only has been shifted in part from the county to the state. The state of Oregon is authorized now to assume the total administrative costs of the county agencies for all three programs.

In Utah, although the counties' share of assistance costs remains fixed at 15 per cent, the county tax levies for assistance purposes now are limited to five mills, and the state government is obligated to supply any deficiency. It has been provided in Montana that the counties' share for aid to dependent children is to be reduced in proportion as federal aid is increased. Nebraska has changed its basis of distribution of aid to counties from population to that of needs. Maine has established local contributions for old-age assistance at 25 per cent of the total cost, but with the proviso that local contributions must not exceed the maximum of \$800,000 per year.

### ***Another County Reform Campaign in New York City***

The Citizens' Non-Partisan Committee has launched a campaign to reorganize the five county governments in the city of New York. This objective is similar to that embodied in the county reform bill sponsored by the minority party in the City Council,<sup>1</sup> but now it is proposed to achieve the end by charter amendment. Petitions are being circulated, and if at least 50,000 signatures are secured by September 6 the proposal will be submitted to the people in the November elections. The work is being organized

for the committee by the Citizens Union of New York City.

The proposal would abolish the five elective sheriffs and the four elective registers replacing them with a single city-wide sheriff and a single city-wide register appointed by the mayor after competitive civil service examinations. The present competitive county employees would be transferred, but in the future all appointments and promotions would be made on the basis of competitive examinations. The sheriffs' criminal jails and custodial functions would be transferred to the city department of correction. If adopted the new plan will go into effect January 1, 1941, except that county officers in office on January 1, 1939, will be allowed to serve out their terms as required by the state constitution.

---

### ***County Health Awards Given***

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the American Public Health Association have announced the results of the annual public health contest conducted under their joint sponsorship and financed by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. For purposes of the contest cities were classified by population and counties by regions.

County winners of the bronze plaques given as first prizes were Alger-Schoolcraft Unit, Michigan; Fayette County, Kentucky; Lauderdale County, Mississippi; St. Mary's Parish, Louisiana; and Wasco County, Oregon.

Three hundred thirteen units, representing 438 counties, participated in the 1939 rural health contest. All counties or county districts having full-time health service were eligible to participate.

The purpose of the annual contest is to promote rural public health work. All contesting counties must have public health committees with representation from business, industry or agriculture, and the professions. Such committees are expected to cooperate with local

---

<sup>1</sup>See NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, February 1940, p. 131.

health, educational, and civic agencies in an effort to improve health conditions, educate the public in disease prevention and decrease loss of life in the area.

The data used as bases for the awards include many factors in addition to the structure and activities of the county health unit. Other major criteria include present status and improvement in: (1) Control of diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid, scarlet fever, whooping cough, measles, pneumonia, tuberculosis, syphilis and gonorrhea; (2) services in maternal, infant, preschool and school hygiene; (3) laboratory services found in the county; (4) milk, water and sewage controls; (5) number of stillbirths and loss of life including automobile accidents; (6) public health work of private physicians and dentists; and (7) extent of citizen participation and interest in public health work.

### **California County Studies Charter**

A grand jury committee of Sanoma County, California, has revived interest once again in a charter to modernize its local government. Several similar attempts at county reform in the past two decades have resulted in defeat for the reform forces. The committee is investigating the operations of the Sacramento County manager charter government in order to secure a firm factual basis for whatever recommendations it may make.

It is believed that the committee will recommend that a committee of freeholders be appointed to draft a charter for submission to the people for final adoption. What the charter will provide is open to conjecture, but there is considerable discussion regarding the manager plan and a merit system of appointments.

### **County Civil Service Referenda Unconstitutional in Wisconsin**

The Risser civil service law for Wis-

consin counties, under which a petition could be presented to a county board compelling it to hold a civil service referendum, has been declared unconstitutional by the circuit court in Dane County. Judge Alvin C. Reis stated: "This is not a question of civil service, but the fundamental issue of what body in the county must govern the county, the board of supervisors or the people. It happens to be the board of supervisors, according to the constitution as construed by our Supreme Court, which held that the grant of power to the county board was exclusive and forbade action by the people."

County boards in Wisconsin have the right to establish civil service systems merely by their own action.

### **Pari-Mutuels Pay Million to New York State**

#### ***Old bonds plague towns; war and the bond market***

*Edited by*

**WADE S. SMITH**

Legalized in 1939 by constitutional amendment, implemented by legislation adopted by the 1940 legislature early this year, pari-mutuel betting has now passed the million-dollar mark in revenues to New York State coffers. The spring racing season opened April 15 at Jamaica, and in the succeeding five and a half weeks betters placed nearly \$20,000,000 across the cashiers' windows, of which the state's share through May 22 was \$1,068,276. Governor Lehman had estimated for the legislature that \$1,000,000 would be received from this source in the current fiscal year, or before July 1.

Under the New York pari-mutuel law, the track and the state split 10 per cent of the amount wagered, plus the breakage—the latter amount representing the difference between winnings arithmeti-



cally computed and winnings actually paid off to the nearest five cents. In the four weeks of the Jamaica meeting \$14,060,508 was wagered. The "take" was \$1,406,050 and the breakage \$115,891, netting the state \$760,970. The Belmont meeting, which began May 13, has had wagers of \$5,700,000 in the first week and a half, with a "take" of \$568,889 and breakage of \$45,724, netting the state \$307,306.

In 1938-39 the state's revenue from horse-racing was \$635,944, according to the Tax Policy League's May 22, 1940, release on horse-racing taxes. This return was from licenses and taxes on admissions. California last year received nearly \$3,000,000 and Florida just over \$2,000,000, revenues in each instance, largely pari-mutuel takes. Massachusetts received over \$2,000,000 also, while Rhode Island, where pari-mutuels attracted considerable attention during their early tenure, received only \$1,100,000. If New York continues at the pace it has already set, its pari-mutuel revenues will outstrip those of any other state.

### **Old Bonds Raise Problem in New York Towns**

Nearly every governmental unit is troubled at some time or other by the problem presented by matured bonds and coupons which are not presented for payment. Few, however, face quite the situation now confronting the New York towns of Little Falls, Manheim, and Danube, in Herkimer County, where bonds issued seventy-one years ago have been presented for payment, according to the Fort Plain, New York *Standard*.

Supervisors of the three towns are deep in conference about the status of forty-eight bonds, each of \$100 denomination, part of issues sold in 1869 to finance a bridge across the Mohawk River. No records have been found as yet to disclose whether the bonds had been retired. The six present owners believe the bonds are worth par and accrued interest.

Most cities and other local units set aside funds for bonds and coupons which have matured but not been presented for payment, but pay no interest from the date of maturity. Best practice is to require the posting of an indemnity bond by the person presenting long past due bonds, to insure the payee against the loss which would result from error or fraud.

### **Bond Market Resists War Shock**

Although the stock market reacted violently to the German invasion of Belgium and the Netherlands, and fell still further as the Nazis pushed toward the British Channel after breaching the Little Maginot Line, the bond market held up remarkably well. Says the *Daily Bond Buyer*, "Municipals of the better grade have given almost as good an account of themselves as treasury issues, without the benefit of federal reserve support."

The *Bond Buyer's* index of municipal bond yields, based on twenty leading bonds, fell to 2.59 per cent on May 1, as compared with 2.62 per cent on April 1, 2.70 per cent on March 1, 2.63 per cent on February 1, and 2.59 per cent on January 1. On May 18 the *Bond Buyer* estimated that, on the average, municipal prices were off about 30 basis points, which is a decline of about one-third as sharp as that which occurred last September. The index of bond yields rose last year from 3.21 per cent at September 1 to 3.30 per cent at October 1. While the yield index for June 1 will probably be several points higher than that of May 1, it will also be considerably under that of October 1, 1939.

A factor preventing any great decline in municipal bond prices is the constantly increasing amount of excess bank reserves. Some observers hold that there is no industrial expansion in sight, including even great plant additions to carry out the administration's rearmament program, which will sufficiently drain reserves to

place municipal creditors in such competition with other borrowers as to greatly increase municipal interest rates.

### ***Wisconsin Tax Sales Decline***

Private bidding for tax liens in Wisconsin increased last year, according to figures compiled by the Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance in its May 15, 1940, bulletin. Taxes for 1938 sold last year, which amounted to 11.1 per cent of all taxes levied, went 21.1 per cent to private bidders while 78.9 per cent were bid in by the counties. In 1938 taxes for 1937, amounting to 14.7 per cent of the levy, had been sold 10.2 per cent to private bidders and 89.8 per cent to the counties. The total amount of real estate taxes sold last year was just over \$11,000,000, as compared with just under \$14,000,000 in 1938. The peak was in 1933, when \$24,000,000 of taxes were sold, comprising 27.9 per cent of the real estate levy for that year.

### ***Revenue Problems on the Radio***

The United States Office of Education has recently prepared a series of radio scripts on problems of municipal government which are available for the use of schools and civic groups. Of fifteen scripts already issued three deal with public finance:

**The Business of Budgets**—How do citizens raise funds to finance their municipal services? What does the tax dollar buy? How is it apportioned?

**Budget Bludgeoneers**—How do pressure groups agitate for special consideration in the municipal budget? How demands are met.

**The Pros and Cons**—How the efficient local government acts as mediator in the plea for "reduced local government costs" on the one hand and the demand for "more and better service" on the other.

Application for the scripts should be

made to the Educational Radio Script Exchange, United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.

### **Cambridge to Vote Again on P. R. and Manager**

***Other cities plan referenda too; P. R. bills at Trenton; P. R. considered in Baltimore***

*Edited by*

**GEORGE H. HALLETT, JR.**

On May 6, 1940, another movement was launched to obtain a so-called Plan E or city manager-proportional representation type of charter for the city of Cambridge, Massachusetts. On that date Dean James M. Landis of the Harvard Law School, continuing chairman of the Cambridge Plan E Committee, filed petitions containing 9,078 signatures with the city clerk to place the proposal on the ballot next November. Only 5,285 signatures, 10 per cent of the registered voters at the 1938 gubernatorial election, were required. Much credit for this fine result is due the Cambridge League of Women Voters.

An accompanying statement by Dean Landis indicated extraordinary interest in the new charter as reported by volunteer workers who solicited signatures in all fifty-five precincts of the city. "Two years ago late passage of the optional 'Plan E' statute delayed us in organizing a wide educational campaign. Early filing of this year's petition will give greater time to acquaint the voters with all features of the plan." He urged local organizations to arrange for Plan E speakers between now and election day.

In 1938 the Plan E movement failed by the close margin of 19,955 in favor and 21,722 against. The whirlwind campaign, with many humorous touches and

an appeal to the courts, attracted much publicity and helped to educate the voters.

This year publicity promises to be equally good. Another favorable element for a new charter is the threat of a six-dollar increase in this year's Cambridge tax rate, as to which city authorities and the Cambridge Taxpayers' Association are engaging in a legal suit.

HERMAN C. LOEFFLER

Boston Municipal Research Bureau

### ***Other Massachusetts Referenda***

The city of Chicopee, which two years ago narrowly missed adopting Plan D (the manager plan without P.R.) is to vote this year on Plan E. Petitions have already been filed.

Massachusetts' second city, Springfield, is likely to have a vote on Plan E also. Petitions have been printed, and a long program of education conducted by the Springfield Taxpayers Association should facilitate collection of the required signatures.

Interest is reported also from several other cities, including Quincy, where a P.R.-manager proposal was defeated in 1938, Worcester, Lynn, North Adams, and Leominster.

### ***Campaign Launched in White Plains***

The City Government League of White Plains has started its campaign to secure the city manager form of government and the election of a council by proportional representation. The veto by Governor Herbert H. Lehman of the bill banning referenda on charter changes in successive years cleared the ground for action.<sup>1</sup> George H. Hallett, Jr., of the Citizens Union of New York City, addressed an organization meeting in early April.

On May 17 Mrs. Edith P. Welty, member of the Yonkers city council, elected last fall by P.R., opened the public cam-

paign. She told of the accomplishments already secured in her city. Short-term money has been borrowed at three-tenths of one per cent by the city manager government. Automobile tires are now purchased at a saving ranging from five dollars to fifty dollars a tire. Savings in all purchases are being effected. Unnecessary jobs have been abolished, and the city is on its way to the first treasury surplus Yonkers has ever had. "What Yonkers has done, White Plains can do," was the sentiment of the meeting.

The petitions were given out at the meeting and nearly one hundred workers are getting them signed up. Workers report warm sympathy on the part of the public toward the campaign.

The City Government League is already building up its membership for a vigorous campaign. Joseph Allen, a professor in New York City College, is president of the league. Mrs. Carl E. Whitney is chairman of the membership drive. All those who participated in the campaign of 1939 for proportional representation in White Plains have re-enlisted in the campaign for city manager with P.R. and the increasingly heavy tax burden is making recruits for city managerial efficiency.

The charter changes, drafted locally, were based on the mature study of those who made the *Model City Charter* for the National Municipal League, together with expert advice from Mr. Hallett.

A. V. BRISSON

White Plains

### ***P. R. Bills in New Jersey***

Senator Crawford Jamieson of Mercer County introduced two P.R. bills in the New Jersey legislature on April 29. One of these merely sets up a set of P.R. provisions in the state election law, suitable for adoption in any other law by reference. The second proposes the first use of this machinery by providing P.R. as the standard method of electing the

<sup>1</sup>See NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW for May 1940, p. 343.



council in municipalities which adopt the manager plan of government. Municipalities which have already adopted the manager plan with the plurality elections at large prescribed by the present law would hold referenda at the fall election to decide whether they should change to P.R. or not.

There is particular interest in these bills in the city of Newark, where the Citizens Union—a new civic body with some 8,400 dues-paying members—is promoting the city manager plan with P.R. after an unsuccessful attempt this spring to get the manager plan under the present law. It is not expected that the bills can pass this year.

### ***A Report on P. R. for Baltimore***

The Baltimore Commission on Governmental Efficiency and Economy issued in April a comprehensive staff report on *Baltimore Elections and Proportional Representation*. The report is really a survey of the entire electoral situation in the city, with special but by no means exclusive reference to P.R. The survey is presented "in view of Baltimore's growing interest in this subject."

The first part of the report contains a study of Baltimore's present election system to see how far it meets the criteria that "A good election system should assure these basic results: (1) Wide participation of citizens in voting; (2) Representation in proportion to voting strength; (3) Election of outstanding and capable representatives."

Numerous tables, charts, and maps are given to bring out the facts on these and related questions in various parts of the city. It is shown that only 40 per cent of Baltimore's voting age population vote in mayoralty elections, with a somewhat smaller percentage voting for council, and that the always successful "Democratic candidate for mayor is selected in the primary by the vote of less than a

third of that party's registered voters."

On the second question it is shown that "Representation in city council is not in proportion to the voting strength of like-minded groups. Democrats with 72 per cent of the registered voters obtain 95 per cent or seventeen members of the city council, while the Republicans with 25 per cent of the registered voters obtain only 5 per cent or one member of the city council."

Other anomalies are brought out. Because of gross inequalities in the size of the six districts, which elect three councilmen each, "a city councilman in a smaller district often is elected by fewer votes than a defeated candidate receives in a larger district." The districts are obviously gerrymandered also. At present, however, no equitable division of the city into six districts would give the Republicans or the large Negro population a normal majority in any one of them. Minority representation in Baltimore can only be secured regularly by some such means as P.R.

Because of its policy of avoiding comment on individual officeholders, the commission does not discuss at length its third criterion in regard to the calibre of the representatives elected. "The generally known fact should not be overlooked, however," it says, "that candidates for city council often are unknown to many voters even within their own particular districts. Under the present system of district representation, city councilmen do not depend for election upon a city-wide appraisal of their outstanding qualifications and civic-mindedness. The tendency rather is to produce councilmanic candidates whose interest is centered in their own districts rather than in the city as a whole, because they are dependent for election upon the support of only their own particular districts."

The Hare system of P.R. is described and its suitability to cure the defects of

Baltimore's present election system examined. With regard to participation in elections the report says: "The often expressed opinion that many 'Republicans' register as 'Democrats' in Baltimore in order to vote in the Democratic primary, claims further that such voters then seldom bother to vote in the general election as they look upon such vote as usually futile in Democratic Baltimore, but that under a nonpartisan or P.R. system wider voting would be encouraged on candidates for all offices."

The report warns that "politics is not automatically eliminated by the P.R. system . . . if the people as a whole do not vote," but adds, "if more people actively concern themselves with municipal elections and actually vote, candidates representing the so-called independent thinking voter, will have a much better chance of election under the P.R. system."

In regard to its other criteria for a good election system the commission reports: "During this study the staff consulted various interests, official and private, in the cities using the proportional representation system, in order to discover particularly any objectionable features that had developed in actual experience with the system. All except one of these sources of practical experi-

ence agreed that the theoretical advantages claimed for the proportional representation system actually are obtained in practice—that it is the only method for securing a strong minority in city council, and that the character of councilmanic work on the whole had noticeably been improved under the P.R. system."

It then gives a reasonable summary of drawbacks which must be balanced against these advantages, starting with the necessity for a continuous educational campaign to get the best results. It also lists other advantages of the plan, such as the elimination of primaries and the fact that "it allows a voter to express a free choice among numerous candidates without the fear of 'throwing his vote away'."

Whether the Baltimore city charter is amended to provide for P.R. or not, the commission recommends consideration of a number of other electoral changes, including the nonpartisan ballot, election of councilmen at large, a reduction in the size and an accompanying increase in the salaries of the council, nonpartisan civil service appointment of local election officials, a reduction in the size of the permanent election staff, and the use of more public buildings as polling places.

## CONTRIBUTORS IN REVIEW

(Continued from Page 413)

**STATISTICAL** mainstay of the Detroit Bureau of Governmental Research, **Rosina Mohaupt** (*The Bonded Debt of 272 Cities*) has appeared semi-annually for several years in the NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW, which publishes her regular debt and tax rate studies. To add to her already extensive equipment, Miss Mohaupt spent last summer at Columbia University, studying advanced statistics, and expects to get a new degree this month.

**TWENTY** years background in public school work girded **Jesse J. Pugh** (*A Civics Course for Today*) for the project in citizenship education which he originated. Dr. Pugh is supervisor of citizenship and vocational education in the Zanesville, Ohio, public schools and wrote "Our Community in Action," the civics course used in Zanesville schools. He is an Ohioan by birth and education, and has contributed to numerous educational magazines.

# Books in Review

EDITED BY ELSIE S. PARKER

**Government of Cities in the United States.** By Harold Zink. New York City, Macmillan Company, 1939. xii, 636 pp. \$3.50.

Ordinarily the publication of a new textbook is considered a suspicious, rather than an auspicious, event. In most fields there are too many textbooks, and regrettably many of them are pot-boilers filled with warmed over stew.

This book is different. For one thing, there are surprisingly few textbooks in the field of general municipal government. For another, the field changes so rapidly that the lapse of a few years makes a new book altogether justifiable. Finally, municipal government is becoming more and more a respectable subject for university teaching, and textbooks are a real need.

Professor Zink's book is admirably complete. It covers, in a manner which should be entirely intelligible to college students, the political and social place of cities in the United States and their place in the governmental system of the country, the legal aspects of city government with adequate attention to charters, municipal elections and politics not forgetting pressure groups, the forms of city government, the various functions of city government, and the question of citizen apathy. There is also an interesting outline in the appendix of a municipal survey which may be assigned to students by way of the project method of learning.

Physically, this is a handsome and readable book. The literary style does not descend to textbook dullness, although there is a certain circumspection in the measured sentences which suggests that the author may be keeping in leash both his prejudices and his sense of humor.

M. R.

**The Municipal Yearbook, 1940.** Edited by Clarence E. Ridley and Orin F. Nolt-ing. Chicago, International City Managers' Association, 1940. x, 629 pp. \$5.00.

*The Municipal Yearbook* needs no introduction to those whose work or interest is municipal government and administration. It is the familiar all-useful compendium of information on local governmental units, on municipal personnel, on municipal finance, municipal activities, municipal officials. This year the editors have instituted innovations of subject matter and arrangement which further increase the book's helpfulness.

New material includes statistics on civil service agencies in cities over 30,000 population, number of local taxing units in the United States, centralized purchasing, annual municipal reports, city planning data for cities over 30,000, a complete list of registered municipal hospitals in the country, detailed data on all low-cost public housing projects, a list of all cities with parking meters and revenue therefrom, accident record and traffic safety activities in the 415 cities in the 1939 traffic safety contest, and detailed information on refuse collection and disposal practices in 165 cities.

Arrangement of the material has been altered so as to group into a single section all the articles and tabular information pertaining to a particular function or activity. This is a particularly logical change.

At the risk of coining a phrase, it must be said that the *Municipal Yearbook* is a "must" for your library.

M. R.

**The Government of New Hampshire.** By Thorsten V. Kalijarvi and William C. Chamberlin. Durham, N. H., Uni-



versity of New Hampshire, 1939. 283 pp. \$2.50.

New Hampshire is neither a large nor a populous state and, consequently, has been able to govern itself with governmental organizations, both state and local, that are not only outmoded but intricate and inefficient. In adhering to the traditional forms of government which set up many checks and balances and which have many and sometimes relatively large governing bodies, the citizens of the Granite State seem to have secured popular democracy and citizen control, but one wonders whether or not they have obtained good government.

Kalijarvi and Chamberlin present an objective treatment of state, county, and local government. While it is true that the material has been presented in a form that carefully avoids controversial issues, this survey of New Hampshire government nevertheless makes it clear that there is much that could be improved.

The book consists of a simple, straightforward recitation of the organizations that make up the government of New Hampshire and the duties and services that they perform. At the end of each chapter is a bare summary of governmental trends. In concluding the work, the authors present a list of problems that seem to them most significant in the immediate future of New Hampshire government. Their analysis is supplemented with the state constitution, copies of primary and official ballots, a chart of New Hampshire government, a map of the state, and a printed reproduction of the state flag. The book has been well footnoted and indexed.

As a secondary reference for those who wish to learn about the government of New Hampshire this book should serve very well. Many studies of state and local government fall into the same category. Without in any way wishing to disparage the writing of more books of this kind—which are sorely needed in

a field generally covered only by official manuals or comparative studies or isolated functions of state government—it seems there is a great need for the publication of critical and sometimes iconoclastic studies of governments of particular states. For the national government this need is met by several excellent studies. For the government of particular cities, one can turn to a number of volumes written by municipal experts. There is nowhere to be found, however, any single volume on the government of a state that is both scholarly and uninhibited.

ROBERTS CHICKERING

Indiana University

---

**Kentucky Government.** A Report on the Executive and Administrative Work of the Kentucky State Government, 1935-1939. Frankfort, 1940. 64 pp.

Governor A. B. (Happy) Chandler stepped out of office with a handsome gesture. Without a doubt, it is high time that the states as well as the cities began to offer a public accounting of their activities in behalf of the taxpayer.

Here the progress of Kentucky state government over four years of Chandler rule is most attractively related, with generous use of such physical properties as a celluloid ring binder, numerous excellent photographs, plenty of pictorial charts and opulent slick paper. The literary style is also geared to a voter's non-technical mental equipment. A welcome feature is a final section titled "Looking Forward," which with apparent frankness sketches some of the broad problems to be faced in Kentucky government during the coming years. Another interesting section is on "Federal-State-Local Relationships," although it is regrettable that only two pages are devoted to a subject of such comprehensive importance.

M. R.

## Additional Books and Reports Received

### *Education*

**Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy.** By The Educational Policies Commission. Washington, D. C., 1940. 227 pp.

**Some Aspects of School Administration in Cook County.** Springfield, Illinois Legislative Council, Research Department, 1940. 67 pp. mimeo.

### *Elections and Voting*

**Calendar of Annual Town Meetings and Elections in Massachusetts.** By Charles J. Rohr. Amherst, Massachusetts State College, Bureau of Public Administration, 1940. 9 pp. mimeo.

**The Poll Tax.** By Frank P. Graham, Barry Bingham, George C. Stoney, James C. Morrison, H. Clarence Nixon, and Tarleton Collier. Washington, D. C., American Council on Public Affairs, 1940. 23 pp. 25 cents.

### *Fee System*

**The Fee System as a Method of Compensating County Officials.** By the Research Division of The Kentucky Legislative Council. Lexington, Kentucky, 1940. 134 pp. mimeo.

### *Initiative and Referendum*

**The Initiative and Referendum in Colorado.** Prepared by the Legislative Reference Office. Denver, Colorado, 1940. 26 pp. mimeo.

### *Municipal Government*

**City of Ironton, Ohio.** Annual Report, 1939. Ironton, City Manager, 1940. 29 pp.

**City Problems of the West.** The Proceedings of the Western Regional Conference of the United States Conference of Mayors, Portland, Oregon, April 8-9, 1940. Edited by Paul V. Betters. Wash-

ington, D. C., United States Conference of Mayors, 1940. iii, 88 pp. \$2.00.

**The Powers and Duties of Mayors in Wisconsin Cities.** A Summary of Wisconsin Statutory Requirements. Madison, League of Wisconsin Municipalities, 1940. 13 pp. mimeo.

### *Planning*

**Federal Relations to Local Planning.** Prepared for the Local Planning Committee by Melville C. Branch, Jr. Washington, D. C., National Resources Planning Board, 1939. 364 pp. mimeo.

### *Politics*

1940. By Jay Franklin. New York City, The Viking Press, 1940. 319 pp. \$2.75.

**So You Want to Be a Politician!** Or how to be an effective Republican Precinct Worker. By William Harrison Petridge with a Foreword by John Hamilton. Chicago, Young Republican Magazine, 1939. 48 pp.

### *Public Welfare and Relief*

**Job Analysis.** A time study of the functions and routines of carrier unit workers on unemployment files under the reorganization program of the State Relief Administration in Los Angeles County. By Special Study Group, Saul Pollock, Director. Los Angeles, State Relief Administration, 1940. 57 pp. mimeo.

**Social Relationships and Institutions in Seven New Rural Communities.** By Charles P. Loomis. Washington, D. C., United States Department of Agriculture, The Farm Security Administration and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1940. 82 pp. mimeo.

**Special Forms of Public Assistance—Mothers' Pensions, Blind Relief, and Old-Age Assistance.** Springfield, Illinois Legislative Council, Research Bureau, 1940. 39 pp. mimeo.

**The Administration of Relief in Illinois.** Springfield, Illinois Legislative



Council, Research Department, 1940. 40 pp. mimeo.

**The Public Welfare Directory 1940.** A Listing of State and Local Public Assistance and Welfare Agencies. Edited by Ralph E. Spear. Chicago, American Public Welfare Association, 1940. viii, 154 pp. \$1.00.

**The Record for 1939.** WPA in New York City. New York City, Work Projects Administration, 1940. 82 pp. illus.

### ***Social Security***

**Factors Involved in Pension Legislation for Governmental Employees in Illinois.** Springfield, Illinois Legislative Council, Research Department, 1940. 43 pp. mimeo.

**Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance for Workers and Their Families.** Washington, D. C., Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, 1940. 15 pp.

**One Hundred Questions and Answers on the New Social Security Program.** Washington, D. C., Federal Security Agency, Social Security Board, 1939. 24 pp.

**Report of Examination of Public Pension Funds.** Springfield, Illinois, Department of Insurance, 1939. 271 pp. mimeo.

### ***State Government***

**California State Government.** An Outline of Its Administrative Organization from 1850 to 1936. By Elsey Hurt. Sacramento, California, Supervisor of Documents, 1937. x, 252 pp. 75 cents.

**California State Government.** An Outline of Its Administrative Organization (Vol. 2)—The Independent Agencies, 1850 to 1939. By Elsey Hurt. Sacramento, California, Supervisor of Documents, 1939. vii, 166 pp. 75 cents.

**State of California: Elections Code,** 363 pp. \$1.50; **Harbors and Navigation Code,** 296 pp. \$1.00; **Health and Safety Code,** 669 pp. \$2.00; **Public Resources Code,** 208 pp. \$1.00; **Streets and High-**

**ways Code,** 137 pp. 75 cents; **Welfare and Institutions Code,** 253 pp. \$1.00. Sacramento, California, Supervisor of Documents, 1939.

### ***Taxation***

**Considerations Involved in the Adoption of Selected Property Tax Dates.** Springfield, Illinois Legislative Council, Research Department, 1939. 17 pp. mimeo.

**Report of the Tax Department and the Tax Commission of the City of New York** for the year ending December 31, 1938, and the half-year period ending June 30, 1939, to the Mayor of the City of New York. By Research Bureau of Tax Department. New York, 1939. 86 pp.

**State Forest Tax Law Digest of 1939.** By Louis S. Murphy. Washington, D. C., Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 1939. 56 pp. mimeo.

**State Tax Administration.** By Robert S. Ford and Frank M. Landers. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Bureau of Government, 1940. 18 pp. Ten cents.

**The Supreme Court and the Use Tax.** New York City, Tax Policy League, 1940. 7 pp. mimeo. Twenty-five cents.

**Trends in State and Local Taxes in Oklahoma from 1931 to 1939, Inclusive.** Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Tax Commission, Division of Research and Statistics, 1940. 9 pp. charts.

### ***Trade Barriers***

**Highway Barriers.** Washington, D. C., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1940. 72 pp.

### ***Training for the Public Service***

**Proceedings of the Advisory Conference on Public-Service Training** at Washington, D. C., April 27-29, 1939. Washington, D. C., United States Office of Education, 1939. 117 pp. mimeo.

**Standards in Police Training.** Washington, D. C., Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, 1939. 94 pp. mimeo.